



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_51673
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic manipulation and product shelf life: Is there a connection? A developing world perspective
Type of the Article	

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>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Line 5-9: Genetic manipulation also includes conventional plant breeding and not just recombinant DNA technology. In effect, it is not only GMO's that are developed through genetic manipulation. The authors should clearly state the objective of the review and what readers should expect. That will help to ascertain whether they succeeded in doing proper review.</p> <p>Introduction The authors are using two types of citation in the text; numbering and full name of reference. They should stick to one style. Table 1: the authors should draw an actual table. Table 2: the authors should draw a table which can be edited when the need arises The authors appear to dwell on only one reference; Uzogara 2000 for both the Risks and benefits associated with GMO's. They should diversify the citations. They should look for other publications on the subject matter to seek diverse opinions.</p> <p>Line 166: The authors should validate the correct spelling of "flavr savr" Lines 173-176: The word "apricot" is repeated Line 182: Extended should read, "extend" Lines 216-244: The authors should reconsider the line spacing here. Line 223: The authors should consider writing C2H4 in full.</p> <p>References The authors need to be consistent. Some initials in the references have been punctuated whilst others have not. Line 292: The title of this reference has been written in bold. The authors should be consistent with the citations. Line 320: the authors in this publication need to be separated</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There is no flow of thought. The authors should clearly state the objective of the paper or what this review seeks to do. Additionally, the authors need to increase the number of different citations that report on the potential benefits and risks associated with GMO's The authors need to stick to one style of writing the title of the journals. In some cases, they have used the shortened forms of the journals whilst in other instances, they have used the full name.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>This paper contains a lot of valuable information on how GM technology can be used to improve the shelf-life of vegetables. However, the authors seem to limit the scope of "genetic modification/manipulation" to only "recombinant DNA technology". Genetic manipulation also includes conventional plant breeding.</p> <p>The authors should also review the paper to reflect the different sections and what they talk about. Finally, the authors should clearly state the objectives of the paper.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Joseph Adjebeng-Danquah
Department, University & Country	CSIR-Savanna Agriculture Research Institute, Ghana