

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119482
Title of the Manuscript:	Genotype x environment Interaction and stability of heading time and grain yield of 12 open pollinated sorghum varieties across different agro-ecological zones in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Review 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> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly for Sorghum future improvement</li> <li>➤ The title of the manuscript/article is suitable and can be complement of the research work conducted on the crop (Sorghum)</li> <li>➤ Abstract part of the paper is more of comprehensive, except background part (rationale of the study)</li> <li>➤ Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate according to my observations</li> <li>➤ The manuscript is scientifically correct and meaningful</li> <li>➤ The references for this paper are more or less sufficient but try to incorporate recently promoted or published references to make more updated</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For scholarly communications, the quality of English language throughout the manuscript is very good and can be understandable by any person around the scientific community</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None</li> </ul>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zeru Yimer Kebede</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pawe Agricultural Research Center (PARC), Ethiopia</b>