

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_112479
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Evaluation of Early maturing Sugarcane Clones for Yield, Quality and Resistance to Red Rot Disease
Type of the Article	Scholarly 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. This research is of much importance to the sugarcane farmers in selecting the variety of sugarcane which will provide maximum yield, is of quality and considered to be better resistant to diseases. The community would benefit (especially the sugarcane farmers and the Sugar Mills) from improved variety of cane stalks for eastern Indians.</li> <li>2. The title of the article needs rephrasing as current title requires some clarity. A suggested title would be "Yield, Quality and Disease Resistance of Sugarcane Clones: A Field Evaluation"</li> <li>3. More work is required to bring clarity.</li> <li>4. The sections and structure is considered to be accurate. Literature Review is missing. This is an important section which warrants research. There is no section on L/R.</li> <li>5. Satisfactory</li> <li>6. References are insufficient, more early references are required.</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>Thorough English proof reading is required including sentence structure and grammar. No Linking devices used. The article must have a flow.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, paper is very interesting; policy direction can be made to ensure the best varieties are planted.</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>Shivneil Kumar Raj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The University of Fiji, Fiji</b>