

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121186
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization nutrients required for raising pro tray chip budded sugarcane seedlings for SSI technology
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript is very useful for scientific community. It describes the study of the standardization of nutrient mixture for improving the quality of protrait chip budded seedlings of sugarcane (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) for SSI (Sustainable Sugarcane Initiative).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title of the article is suitable (Elaborate the full form of SSI in the Heading)	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate	
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.	Manuscript is scientifically correct. It contains factual research data in tabulated form and is presented in chronological order with proper explanation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are very less. Try to give at least 20-25 references according to the prescribed rules of the journal.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, English is good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
	I have given some minor corrections/suggestions in the main manuscript. Kindly try to correct them before final submission. This will enhance the quality of your paper.	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hridesh Harsha Sarma
Department, University & Country	India