



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_CJAST_50674</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Growth Performance of Crescentia cujete (Robx) Seedlings as Influenced by Different Watering Regimes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>This report is very trivial; the type of experiment done preliminary to experimentation. There is nothing wrong with the paper other than it provides little information except to the authors. How much water plants need to proliferate is normally the result of pot size, soil media, and evaporative load placed on the experimental units, which will change from location to location. I don't see any value to this manuscript, but if the journal wants to print this drivel, there's nothing mechanically wrong with it.</p> <p>There is something wrong with the pattern of the response. There were significant improvements watering every 3 days but watering every 4 days was significantly worse whereas watering every 5 days was best of all with a significant drop in response watering every 6 days. The author made no mention of random assignment of treatments to experimental units and experiment may be biased resulting in systematic errors due to location in the greenhouse, etc. Systematic errors always show up as significant treatment effects in analysis of variance. Maybe the authors should explain assignment of treatments to experimental units.</p>	We have revised the manuscript as per the comments attached
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	