



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_47731
Title of the Manuscript:	Caryopsis germination in different methodologies of energy cane crossing
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>The paper is important because it provides information on methodologies to advance more quickly in the breeding of varieties of sugarcane</p> <p>The objective of the research is clear and precise The results are presented clearly and precisely, their interpretation is easy to follow both in the text and in the tables. They are correctly analyzed. The discussion of the results focuses appropriately on them The conclusions are strong are based correctly on the results obtained.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The research is very well planned, conducted and it is reflected in the paper, which maintains a scientific coherence from the introduction to the conclusions. By way of observation a critical vision of the author could be included in the conclusions of how to continue the investigation with these results, if a greater number of studies are required or can be applied directly to the improvement of varieties of sugarcane</p>	
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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Martín María Silva Rossi
Department, University & Country	Estudio Agronómico, Argentina