

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126364
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Growing Media and Dormancy Breaking Chemical on the Seedling Growth of High Chill Peach
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript is important for the scientific community, to take advantage of some techniques to improve the germination of some seeds that may be exposed to inappropriate environmental conditions during the period of natural germination	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	No Evaluation of Growing Media and Chemical on the Seedling Growth of High Chill Peach <b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>Yes</b> What appears in the title should not appear in the keywords	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>Yes</b> <b>Bus there are some notices</b> Since the experiment is a factorial and consisting of two factors, the effect of each individual factor must be shown in a results beside the interaction between two factors, all results appeared in the tables was the interaction between the two factors, where is the impact of each factor ???	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because, the researcher used different techniques to increase the germination percentage, which allows diversity in testing the best methods	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes	
<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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Eltayeb Ahmed Hamad Suliman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sudan</b>