



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_52432
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of seasonal changes on growth performance and leaf biomass production of two Moringa oleifera varieties grown under Sahelian condition in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>Specify the statistical analysis applied to the variables of growth and biomass production.</p> <p>Add the outstanding results in terms of numbers of "seedlings growth parameters and foliar biomass of two varieties of <i>Moringa oleifera</i>".</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <p>Provide information about the physic-chemical characteristics of soils of the study sites and the type of soil used for the experiment.</p> <p>Specify the treatments were subjected to statistical analysis.</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>Results on "soil properties in the two sites before the trial set up at Bani and Tougou" lack the separation of means for statistical significance by using the test of Tukey HSD (Honestly Significant Difference).</p> <p>Results on "plant growth and survival under effect of a deficit of essential nutrients; and the seedling growth & their influence on root growth and root activities" were not properly discussed with the similar findings of other authors.</p> <p>The discussion conducted in this section looks like a simple review of literature.</p> <p>The results of "The emergence delay of shoots" were not compared with similar results from other authors.</p> <p>For growth variables is not recommended to realize multiple analysis of variance, because each factor contains two levels (one degree of freedom). This situation, when the degree of freedom is minimal could lead to overestimation of the results. In this case it is recommendable to use the student t test for each factor.</p> <p>Compare results on "early growth variables (height and leaves number at the 40th day) at the study sites (Bani and Tougou) as influenced by the different factors and their combination" with similar results from other authors.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Rahim Foroughbakhch</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León, Mexico</i>