

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_97582
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on yield and quality of sugarcane (<i>Saccharum officinarum</i> L.) first ratoon.
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:

(<https://www.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>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>	<p>1. This article is very important for the scientific world.</p> <p>2. The title of the article corresponds well because the title reflects the content.</p> <p>3. the abstract of the article is very very comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically well written.. It is one of the best articles that I can evaluate. There are very interesting data and above all the discussion was very well done by the author. A very rich discussion, with really recent references.</p> <p>6. The references are really very sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Well-written Abstract but in the latter, there is not only a lack of numerical results and statistical analysis. It is true that the irrigation deficit had a negative effect on the yield parameters of sugar cane. At this level, the author had to mention some quantified parameters in the abstract. Also, he had to notify the quality parameters studied and then briefly describe the method of measuring these parameters.</p> <p>2. In this article, the experiment was very well conducted. It is excellent work, very scientific and well argued.</p> <p>3. Honestly, I am very satisfied with this article. But still there are a few observations missing which, if taken into account, can improve the quality of the article. The main observations are among others:</p> <p>✓ At the level of 2.2. Experimental design, it is said that the first crop of sugarcane was established in December and harvested in January when it was 13 months old. Here the author had to indicate the years, otherwise the reader has the impression of a month instead of 13 months if the years are not specified.</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yerima Bako Djibo Aboubacar
Department, University & Country	Université Djibo Hamani de Tahoua, Niger