

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is particularly valuable for its focus on developing early maturing sugarcane varieties, which are crucial for meeting the needs of farmers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article should be revised to include the word "maturing" to better reflect the core focus of the study. A rephrased title could be: "Validation of Early Maturing Sugarcane Clones for Yield and Juice Quality Traits" This revision allows readers to immediately understand the main focus of the study.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is fairly comprehensive, covering the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, it could be improved by including a few additional details for clarity and emphasis: Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Highlight the Focus on Early Maturity: Explicitly mention the importance of early maturing sugarcane clones in the abstract to align with the study's focus. For example, explain why early maturing varieties are beneficial to farmers and the sugar industry. Clarify Methodology: Provide a brief mention of the experimental design (e.g., Randomized Block Design with two replications) to give readers a better understanding of how the study was conducted. (making the methodology more transparent) Emphasize Key Results: Include specific numerical values or percentages from the results to strengthen the claims about superior performance of certain clones. <p>Sample Abstract: The present investigation in sugarcane (<i>Saccharum</i> spp. hybrids) aimed to validate the performance of early maturing clones for yield and quality traits at the Sugarcane Research Station (TNAU), Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu. The experiment was conducted using a Randomized Block Design with two replications, evaluating seven test clones and three standard check varieties for traits such as cane yield, quality parameters, and juice characteristics. Observations included the tiller count, cane length, diameter, single cane weight, brix percentage, sucrose content, and CCS yield. Among the clones, CoC 11336 excelled in cane yield (134.45 t/ha) and CCS yield (16.62 t/ha), while CoV 12356 demonstrated superior juice quality with the highest brix percentage and sucrose content. Early maturing varieties like CoC 11336 and CoA 12321 showed promise for replacing aging commercial varieties, offering higher profitability to farmers and improved sugar recovery at the start of the crushing season. These findings highlight the potential of early maturing clones to enhance sugarcane productivity and profitability, warranting further testing under varied agro-climatic conditions for potential variety release.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate and well-organized for a scientific article. The results are well-categorized, with individual discussions on yield traits, juice quality, and other parameters, allowing readers to follow the findings easily. However, it is essential to go beyond merely describing the data by incorporating their practical implications, such as how these findings can benefit farmers and the sugar industry.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a well-defined experimental design (Randomized Block Design with two replications) to ensure the reliability and reproducibility of the findings. The selection of relevant yield and quality parameters, such as cane yield, brix percentage, and CCS yield, aligns with standard practices in sugarcane breeding and provides a comprehensive evaluation of the clones. The statistical analysis of variance (ANOVA) further validates the significance of the results, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are based on solid data.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The formatting of the references in the manuscript is inconsistent and requires attention to ensure uniformity.</p> <p>Below are observations and suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Inconsistent Citation Style: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some references include the full journal title, while others use abbreviations. 2. Missing Uniformity in Date Placement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some references have publication years at the start, while others place them after the title or journal name. 3. Formatting Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variations in punctuation and spacing between elements of a reference are noticeable. 4. Inconsistent Author Names: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some references use initials for authors (e.g., "Singh PR, Gupta MR"), while others include full names (e.g., "Ganapathy S, Ravichandran V, Jayakumar J"). 5. URLs and DOIs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Web-based references, such as FAO and India stat, are listed without proper formatting or access dates. Example: "Available: http://www.fao.org/faostat" is incomplete without an access date. 	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where improvements can be made to enhance clarity and conciseness.</p> <p>Break long sentences into shorter ones to improve readability. Example: "The present investigation in sugarcane (<i>Saccharum</i> spp. hybrids) was carried out to validate the performance of early duration clones for cane yield and quality characters at sugarcane Research Station (TNAU) Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu" can be revised to "This study evaluated the performance of early-maturing sugarcane clones for yield and quality traits at the Sugarcane Research Station (TNAU), Cuddalore, Tamil Nadu."</p> <p>Replace vague terms with more specific language to improve clarity. Add linking sentences between sections to ensure a logical flow. Ensure consistent use of tense, avoiding unnecessary shifts between past and present tense.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Some areas where the structure could be slightly refined to improve clarity and flow: A thorough proofreading session is recommended to catch minor grammatical errors, typos, and inconsistencies.</p> <p>The paper is a valuable contribution to sugarcane research, particularly in identifying and evaluating early maturing sugarcane varieties. However, I recommend clarifying the criteria used to define "early maturing" clones, specifically in terms of their growth duration (e.g., number of months to maturity) compared to standard varieties. This will provide a clear benchmark for assessing clones in this category.</p> <p>Note: Time to Maturity: The ability of the clone to reach harvestable maturity earlier than standard commercial varieties, typically within a specific number of months (e.g., 10-12 months).</p> <p>For the statistical analysis, I suggest including post hoc analysis results with letter assignments to indicate statistically significant differences among clones for each trait.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rachel Sarol
Department, University & Country	Philippines