



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Material and methods: not clear the Basic units producing 31 types within the same plant spacing (grouping)? What was the experimental design? Number of replication to determine the optimum size? One plant to one BU? What is different between types? Size? Number of plants? (Not clear), explain better how came r=3,5 and 7 What the measurements collected to determine the optimum size and shape?</p> <p>Results: Was the results significant different? Which was the best and which one was not</p> <p>Discussion: The different number of cultivars mentioned was completely new and not mentioned before at materials and methods or result</p> <p>References with no date of revision and website not connected to the information?</p>	Thank you for your comments. We have tried to upgrade the manuscript as per your suggestion.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Explain better how was obtained 31 types of 15 rows with 40 plants Data collection and experimental design</p>	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript need more clarification on material and methods to make it more compressive to readers	

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)	