

ReviewForm1.7

JournalName:	European JournalofNutrition&FoodSafety
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_EJNFS_115243
TitleoftheManuscript:	Awarenessoffarmerson effectofharvesttomillgaponqualityofsugarcane(Saccharumofficinarum)
TypeoftheArticle	

ReviewForm1.7

PART 1: ReviewComments

	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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript attempts to understand level of awareness among farmers, the primary stakeholders, regarding a major quality issue of their harvest. The manuscript is important for policy makers and Government agencies (like Agriculture Extension Services) than scientific community. The findings of the study does not appear to add to the body of scientific knowledge.</p> <p>2. For increasing clarity, the word duration should be added. Suggested Title can be "Awareness of farmer on effect of harvest to mill gap duration on quality of sugarcane"</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. A Literature Review section is needed. Although attempts have been made to elaborate on this in Section 1.1 & 1.2, the sections are not structured. The Literature Survey section should also identify the gaps in present body of knowledge and arrive at Research Objectives. Also, problem statement in the geographical context is needed. A separate Research Objectives Section is needed after Literature Review. Although, the need for research is deliberated in section 1.2, it should be in a separate section. The Methodology Section (2.0) needs to be further elaborated stating as why are a cross-sectional & sampling study being adopted. There should be separate sections/sub sections for Data Analysis, Findings and Discussion. Limitation of the research should be included in the conclusion section.</p> <p>5. The referencing style is not standardised. In text referencing is made using numbers which makes it difficult to understand the author and year details instantly. Also, end text reference list does not follow any standard format. In some references, year is missing. As per policy of the journal, a uniform referencing standard like APA, Harvard is preferred.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Mostly yes, however, some sentences may require revision for giving more clarity.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subrata Nath
Department, University & Country	India