



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_46179
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimum size and shape of experimental units for cassava cropping
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>It seems to me a very interesting research that provides important data on the behaviour of this crop.</p> <p>On the other hand, it works with experimental units, which effectively are difficult to size, although there is a technique proposed by Fisher.</p> <p>It would be interesting for researchers to consider it for future research</p> <p>I think they should expand a little more the discussion regarding the heterogeneity of the soil and what could be a practice that helps to improve this.</p> <p>they should add another conclusion regarding the behaviour of the coefficient of variation with respect to its interpretation, that is, the ranges that best explain the data</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	According	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>No researchers believe they perform experimental work with great professionalism</p>	the article obeys all scientific and ethical rigor from the international point of view