



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	

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	L11 : Write the full experimental design, not abbreviated L11 : Write the experiment years to match years in M&M, see L91 L 42,43: The sentence is not related to the paragraph L78,79 : Rephrase to be comprehensible M&M : Mention the number of used genotypes at the beginning of the Plant material Section M&M: Check number of replications L111: write S in the formula of genotypic variance "GMS and EMS" L120&L123: GCV and PCV should be square rooted, or use formula as standard deviation values. This has resulted in inflation of the GCV and PCV estimations (Table 5) L112,115,121,125,130 and 135 : Numbers are inappropriate L119: Correct to Singh and Chaudhary, 1985 L155 : Rephrase "Phonological trait" M&M: Write the formula for GA as a percentage of the mean Disscusion and in Abstrarct: Interpret the GCV for the clones would be more descriptive to genetic variation than the PCV Disscusion: Write the genotypic and phenotypic correlations keys for table 6. References : Revise the references carefully. Some references are not present in the text of the paper . Some discussions need more citations. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line No.</th><th>Original</th><th>Convert to</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td><td>Analysis</td><td>Analyses</td></tr> <tr> <td>10</td><td>sugarcane clone</td><td>sugarcane clones</td></tr> <tr> <td>11</td><td>RCBD</td><td>randomized complete block design</td></tr> <tr> <td>14</td><td>Nber_stem</td><td>No._stem (and in all</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td>subseque</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>15</td><td>PCVs were</td><td>PCV was</td></tr> <tr> <td>17</td><td>a high heritability value estimate</td><td>high heritability value estimations</td></tr> <tr> <td>21</td><td>r</td><td>correlation coefficient</td></tr> <tr> <td>23</td><td>variable</td><td>variable</td></tr> <tr> <td>23</td><td>of other</td><td>of the other</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Line No.	Original	Convert to	2	Analysis	Analyses	10	sugarcane clone	sugarcane clones	11	RCBD	randomized complete block design	14	Nber_stem	No._stem (and in all			subseque	15	PCVs were	PCV was	17	a high heritability value estimate	high heritability value estimations	21	r	correlation coefficient	23	variable	variable	23	of other	of the other	All correction are done Additions were made to the manuscript underlined in green and yellow for corrections
Line No.	Original	Convert to																																	
2	Analysis	Analyses																																	
10	sugarcane clone	sugarcane clones																																	
11	RCBD	randomized complete block design																																	
14	Nber_stem	No._stem (and in all																																	
		subseque																																	
15	PCVs were	PCV was																																	
17	a high heritability value estimate	high heritability value estimations																																	
21	r	correlation coefficient																																	
23	variable	variable																																	
23	of other	of the other																																	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	36 chromosome chromosomes 38 rearrange the references from old to new 47 special varieties improved varieties 73 soils are soil is 77 The large number A large number 78 clones was clones were 78,78 The sentence is not clear 80 factors Delete the word "factors" 81 was November was at November 82 September2017, and delete "and" 89 Brix Brix% 90 traits of studied studied traits 92 were planted were compared 92, 93 SP70- 1006 If they are two varieites"SP70 and1006" 110 Hill et al.,1998; Johnson et al., 1955 Johnson et al., 1955, Hill et al.,1998 113 replication replications L119 Johnson et al., 1955; Singh et al., 1985 Johnson et al., 1955 as oulined by Singh and Chaudhary., 1985 128 described by described by "Put the reference" 132 accordance according to 136 K=K K is the ... 151 standard deviation standard deviation (SD) 151 mean mean, variance, 167 was had high showed a higher 171-191(Fig. 1) write the measurement units under each dependent variable 193 coefficient coefficients 194 highly significant highly significant differences 201 for 5 trait for the 5 traits 219 in Table5 σ^2_e for stem height should be 0.047 237 correlated among themselves correlated with the others 247 5 traits the 5 traits 247 under the table 6 put key for the values such as The genotypic correlations are the above values The phenotypic correlations are the below values	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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>	