



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43981
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Yield Potential of Wild Blackberry (Rubus. spp) under conventional production practices in Kenya
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>)

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	The manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has scientific quality and statistical support. Parameters evaluated are adequate. Only little errors were found during the revision. The references inside manuscript must be in accordance with rules of this Journal. Write authors and year or references number in square bracket [] in numeric order. Title: Is ok Abstract: Is ok Materials and Methods: Is ok. Results and Discussion: Is ok, only Table 3 write (cm) in the columns of lateral length and internode length. Line 110. In reference Facticeauet al write 9 not 8. Check order To explain the non- production in R.Steundneri and R. Pinnatus. Conclusion: Is ok References: Line 252. Write 32(3):664-679 Line 256. Write Fruit Science Line 261. Write Acta Scientarum and 34(4):439-444 Line 263. Write Science and it is incomplete number pages	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Raúl Leonel Grijalva-Contreras</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias, Mexico</i>