

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_119397</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Growth Dynamics of Sugarcane in North Karnataka</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The article provides significant insights into the growth dynamics of sugarcane in North Karnataka, a crucial crop for the region's agricultural economy. It examines trends over two decades, using robust statistical methods to analyze growth rates and instability in sugarcane cultivation. This research is important as it highlights the need for adopting high-yielding, resilient sugarcane varieties to ensure sustainable production, thus contributing valuable knowledge to agricultural sciences and regional economic studies.</li> <li>2. The current title is appropriate.</li> <li>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It succinctly summarizes the study's objective, methodology, key findings, and implications. It provides a clear overview of the research, making it easy for readers to understand the scope and significance of the study.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The article is well-organized with clear sections for the introduction, methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion.</li> <li>5. Based on the provided sections, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. The use of established statistical methods such as Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR) and Cuddy Della Valle Index to analyze the data ensures a rigorous and reliable examination of the trends in sugarcane cultivation.</li> <li>6. The references appear to be adequate and include relevant studies and reports.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I would say that the overall language and English quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. But, the author need to ensure consistent use of terms and units throughout the article (Example: the use of "lakh" (a term used in South Asia) should be explained or converted to more universally understood terms if the journal has an international audience). Then, some technical terms could be better explained for clarity (Example: "Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR)" and "Cuddy Della Valle Index" are introduced without a brief explanation, which might be confusing for readers unfamiliar with these terms). Also, there are a few typographical errors that suggest the need for careful proofreading (Example: In Table 1: "P roductivity" should be "Productivity" (without space); In the Results and Discussion: "Growth rate of productivity of sugarcane was very low indicating stagnation even though it was positive for the Karnataka state and negative for Bagalkote district." "Karnataka state" should be "Karnataka State" for consistency with proper noun capitalization). For instance, with minor revisions for clarity and consistency, the article's language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</li> </ol>	
<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>R. Ayu Chairunnisya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Indonesia</b>