



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42266
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability of Sugarcane Clones as Affected by Endemic Diseases at One-Row Screening Stage in Ferké, Norhern Ivory Coast
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract: - Should be written significant results from research. Then novelty of work must be indicated here. - Do not use node code (G1 ... G6). Definition of G1..G6 must be given in Material and Methods (MM) section. Introduction: - Support the necessary references for sentences on lines 37, 43, 48, and 49. - In the introduction section it is necessary to show the condition of the disease (leaf scald, smut, pokkah boeng) on the Ivory Coast. This data is required for justification of aimed of study. Material and Methods: - Planting material from what? whether a single bud chips or stem cuttings (line 78). - Requires references support for sentences in the line 97, 104 and 137. Results: - In reading the table or picture do not need to re-read the numbers. Data is read by conveying its data trend and most significantly different. - The bar chart in Figure 1 needs standard deficiencies and needs to explain the amount of data per observation. - Table 1.a and 2 it might not be necessary (deleted). Discussion: - It may be necessary to add more relevant literature to lines 253, 257, 261 and 285. - Things wich nessesary to discuss are significant results and novelty of findings. Conclusion: What is the significant results and novelty of work. Methods need not be written anymore. Delete note code (G1-G6).	Abstract - Ok. Abstract improved as suggested - Ok. Introduction - Reference provided - Conditions of disease infection provided Material and Methods - Stem cuttings - Reference provided Results - Ok, we have improved the reading of data as suggested. - Ok, provided - We would argue that the tables provide a better understanding of families and number of genotypes involved. Discussion - Literature provided - Ok. Discussion improved according suggestion made. Conclusion Ok. We have improved the writing of conclusions pointing out significant findings.
Minor REVISION comments	- Add and re write Java-Indonesia (line 32) - etc in line 83, it needed more detail. - The leaf scald susceptible is equated with the observation of smut and boeng pokkah	- Ok, corrected - More details provided were transferred to the introduction section. - A specific scale is provided for leaf scald according to Rott (1997).
Optional/General comments	-	