

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_127257
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation of Early Sugarcane Clones for yield and juice quality traits
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the validation of early sugarcane clones, which is crucial for enhancing agricultural productivity and sugar quality. By identifying high-performing clones such as CoC 11336 and CoA 12321, the study contributes valuable insights into breeding programs aimed at improving yield and sugar recovery, thus supporting the sugar industry's demand for efficient crop varieties. I appreciate the thoroughness of the research, particularly the comprehensive data collection and analysis methods, which lend robustness to the findings	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is somewhat descriptive but could be more engaging. A suggested alternative title could be: "Evaluation and Validation of High-Yield Early Sugarcane Clones for Enhanced Juice Quality."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a solid overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it could benefit from a brief mention of the implications of the findings for future research or practical applications in the sugar industry. This addition would enhance its comprehensiveness	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined sections that guide the reader through the research process. The subsections are appropriately categorized, making it easy to follow the methodology and results. This organization enhances the clarity and impact of the findings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its rigorous experimental design and statistical analysis. The use of ANOVA to assess the significance of various traits among clones indicates a strong methodological approach. Additionally, the detailed reporting of yield and quality traits provides a comprehensive understanding of the clones' performance. Overall, the study is technically sound and contributes valuable knowledge to the field of sugarcane research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	The references appear to be sufficient and relevant, covering foundational and recent studies in sugarcane research. However, including more recent publications from the last few years could strengthen the literature review. Suggestions for additional references could include recent advancements in sugarcane breeding techniques or studies on climate impact on sugarcane yield.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, though a few grammatical errors and awkward phrasings could be refined for clarity. A thorough proofreading would enhance the manuscript's professionalism.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, this manuscript presents a valuable contribution to the field of sugarcane research, and with minor revisions, it could be a strong candidate for publication. The findings have practical implications for breeders and farmers, promoting the development of high-yielding, quality sugarcane varieties.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Gerema Amente Eseta</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Oromia Agricultural Research Institute, Adami Tulu Agricultural Research Centre, Ethiopia</b>