

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115090
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON THE FIELD PERFORMANCE OF TRUE POTATO SEED OF DIFFERENT ENTRIES UNDER TELANGANA CONDITIONS
Type of the Article	

### 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. 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes. The manuscript will provide an alternative practice for potato farmers that could have potential financial implications as well as increase efficiency in production.</p> <p>2. The word "Studies" could be changed into "Characterization". Nevertheless, the title is suitable enough.</p> <p>3. Listing the values of all parameters seems very convoluted for an abstract. A generalized conclusion with values from the MOST important parameters could be a better option.</p> <p>4. Subsections are appropriate, however, tables and figures from pages 7 to 10 should be properly laid-out. Avoid cutting off tables and figures (and its captions) in between pages.</p> <p>5. I believed that the manuscript is scientifically correct and outstanding.</p> <p>6. References provided were sufficient and recent enough for publication merit.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality is superb and very suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bryan Glomel S. Silverio</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Science and Technology of Southern Philippines, Philippines</b>