

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116288
Title of the Manuscript:	Low cost nursery media for improving germination of chip budded seedlings for SSI
Type of the Article	Research

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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, I think the manuscript is important for scientific community, in particular for plant breeders, farmers who want to start the cultivation of sugarcane.</p> <p>Low-cost nursery media for improving germination of chip budded seedlings for Sustainable Sugarcane Initiative (SSI) - I suggest this title to authors because I didn't know what SSI means. When I searched, I found 2 meanings of SSI: one is Sustainable Sugarcane Initiative, and the other was: Small-scale irrigation.</p> <p>Yes, I think the abstract is very comprehensive, but I suggest to the authors at the end of the abstract to write more specific information about the results like: "the results revealed that there was a significant difference on germination recorded at 20 DAS..."</p> <p>Also I suggest to create a balance between the part where they wrote the methods and the part for the results and conclusions.</p> <p>Yes, I think that the subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, in my opinion the manuscript is scientifically correct. It has a logic and I understand what the authors wrote.</p> <p>Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Yes, the English quality is good, and I understand the content of the article.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Summary of the article: In the article named: " Low cost nursery media for improving germination of chip budded seedlings for SSI", the authors present an alternative to the most commonly used growing media, pure coco peat (more expensive) which is organic growing media with different low cost organic sources as: Press mud, Coir pith, Town compost, Vermicompost, Coco peat for germination of chip budded seedlings. The authors made a comparison between 11 treatments in which these products were used and study different growth parameters like: germination %, survival %, root and shoot length, root, and shoot dry weight, dry matter production and vigor index. They also analysed the cost of treatment to produce sugarcane chip bud seedlings.</p>	

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:	Simina Alina Georgiana
Department, University & Country	Romania