

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_115243
Title of the Manuscript:	Awareness of farmers on effect of harvest to mill gap on quality of sugarcane ( <i>Saccharum officinarum</i> )
Type of the Article	Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript addresses an important topic concerning sugarcane postharvest losses, which is significant for both the scientific community and agricultural stakeholders. Understanding the factors contributing to postharvest losses in sugarcane production can lead to improvements in efficiency and economic sustainability within the industry.</li> <li>2. The title of the article adequately reflects the content, providing a clear indication of the focus on sugarcane postharvest losses and their implications.</li> <li>3. The abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the manuscript, summarizing the key points discussed in the introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion sections. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the main findings or implications of the study.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate, allowing for a logical flow of information from background information to research methodology, results, and conclusions. However, ensuring consistency in formatting and clarity in section headings would improve readability.</li> <li>5. The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a clear methodology for data collection and analysis. However, additional details on specific analytical methods or statistical analyses used could strengthen the scientific rigor of the study.</li> <li>6. The references provided are relevant to the topic and adequately support the discussion. However, it may be beneficial to include more recent references, particularly for studies published within the last five years, to ensure the inclusion of the latest research findings and developments in sugarcane postharvest management practices.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>with some minor revisions to language and clarity, the article will be well-suited for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Prakash Balu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vels University, India</b>