SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_44360**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment of Genetic Variability and Heritability Analysis in Sugarcane Clones Obtained by FUZZ (True Seed) at Northern of Côte d'Ivoire**
Type of the Article	**Research 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	**If the research work was original, the author has to rewrite the manuscript without plagiarism.** **Abstract** In line 11: during of study mentioned as 2016 -17 but in methodology section it was mentioned as November 2015 to September 2017? Controversy statement? **Introduction** In line 39-58: These thirteen lines contain no citations as well as copied from several source with 80% Plagiarism (Babu et al., 2009; Tyagi and Singh, 1998). **Methodology** Methodology section was not clear, and in the line 79 mentioned three different stages and the stages are not explained well. In Line 87 mentioned that number of clones was reduced. On what basis? In Line 97 to 101; Experimental design section was copied from Oura et al., 2018. In line 109 to 148 was copied from Alam et al., 2017 **Result and Discussion** In figure 1 flowering result was mentioned but that was not explained in text. In Line 204, Shivasubramanian et al 1973 mentioned but in bibliography mentioned as Shivasubramnian and Menon 1973? Above all, the discussion section shows complete plagiarism **Reference** Reference not in the journal format as well as not clear.	All correction are done **Additions were made to the manuscript underlined in green and yellow for corrections**
Minor REVISION comments	Major Revisions will need	
Optional/General comments		

SDI Review Form 1.6

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

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	
If plagiarism is suspected, please provide related proofs or web links.	Yes,70%	