



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEAI_55656   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Genotype x Environment Interactions in Sugarcane under Irrigation for Agronomic Traits at Advanced Screening Stage in Ferké, Northern Ivory Coast |
| 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>)

**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 | <p>There is too much discussion in the Material and Methods section.</p> <p>Fig. 1 is missing. Figs 2 and 3 are have no description or indication relating the abbreviations used to identify the variables and the variables. The figures are plenty of data but it is not possible to know what "RDT", "Tlgex103" and etc stand for. The captions for these Figures are practically absent.</p> <p>Figs. 4 and 5 are cropped. There is one "check" variety missing in each of the dendrograms.</p> <p>Tables 7 and 8 are displayed as square matrix and as low triangular matrix, respectively. Why authors did not use a single presentation?</p> <p>Tables in general lack the indication for the meaning of the column titles.</p> <p>It seems to be a good data analysis but it is almost incomprehensible in this presentation. Authors should work a little more to organize the results, specially the figures and tables in a form readers can understand.</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |  |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |  |   |



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Paula Cristina da Silva Angelo</b> |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Brazil</b>                         |