SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_47797**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Morphology and growth of new potato genotypes under different doses NPK**
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	The paper is important because it provides information about the management of nutrition with N P K in potato crops in Brazil The objective of the research is clear and precise. The materials and methods, as well as the experimental design are very well presented. The results are very well presented and analyzed, the effects of interaction between genotypes and nutrient doses are correctly highlighted. It would be interesting to show the interaction effect between the number of tubers and the fertilizer dose for each genotype in a figure, as well as what is shown for the LAI and the absorbance in figure 1. The conclusions are poor, they could be extended emphasizing with greater emphasis the effect of interaction so the response to fertilization depends on the dose and the genotype	
Minor REVISION comments	The research is very well conducted and provides a large amount of relevant information which is correctly analyzed and presented. The bibliography is outdated, the incorporation of citations of the last two years would improve the scientific quality of the paper.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

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