

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_98905
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Sugarcane (Saccharum spp. hybrids) Clones for Yield and Quality and its Contributing traits
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The research is one of the good researches in this field, and the appropriate research and analytical method was used, and the results were consistent with economic theory and statistically correct, so the research is good and does not contain scientific, statistical or spelling errors, but I advise the researcher to do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The research is good and valid for publication, and there are no scientific or linguistic errors. - But it should be expanded on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Another paragraph on the importance of sugar cane in the country and its contribution to self-sufficiency in sugar. - A broader explanation of the research methodology and the statistical method through which the results were drawn. - Recommendations must be accompanied by numbers from the research results (at least two recommendations). - Expanding by one or two paragraphs (if possible) the possibility of generalizing the results at the state level. - I wish the researcher success Expansion of writing recommendations attached to the research results 	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarhan Ahmed Soliman
Department, University & Country	Agriculture Economy Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt