

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JEAI_123929
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation among Yield, Quality and Mechanization amicable traits in Sugarcane Clones
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>The manuscript titled "Correlation among Yield, Quality and Mechanization Amicable Traits in Sugarcane Clones" holds significant importance for the scientific community as it explores the intricate relationships between various traits that influence sugarcane production. By analyzing the correlations among yield, quality, and mechanization-friendly characteristics, this study provides valuable insights that can aid in the development of high-performing sugarcane clones. The findings could enhance breeding strategies, improve agricultural practices, and ultimately contribute to more sustainable and efficient sugarcane cultivation, addressing the needs of both farmers and the agroindustry at large.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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 provided is fairly comprehensive, as it outlines the key components of the study, including the experimental design, significant findings, and implications for sugarcane genotype selection. However, it could benefit from a bit of refinement for clarity and conciseness. Here are some suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objective and Purpose: Clearly state the primary objective of the research to help readers understand the study's aim. 2. Key Findings: The results are reported well, but summarizing the significance of these findings would enhance clarity. Consider briefly highlighting the practical implications of the identified correlations. 3. Mechanization Aspect: The mention of mechanization amicable traits is important but could be more explicitly tied to the implications for agricultural practices. 4. Conclusion: A brief concluding sentence summarizing the significance of the overall findings would strengthen the abstract. <p>Overall, while the abstract conveys important information, addressing these points could make it more accessible and impactful to the reader.</p> <p>Get smarter answer from GPT-4o</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>yes</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 demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous methodology, comprehensive literature review, and clear presentation of data. The authors have employed appropriate statistical analyses to validate their findings, ensuring that the results are both reliable and reproducible. Additionally, the manuscript adheres to current research standards, avoiding common pitfalls such as data manipulation. The clarity and organization of the tables and figures further enhance the manuscript's technical soundness, making the data easily interpretable.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in this manuscript appear to be both sufficient and recent, covering a wide range of relevant studies and sources. The inclusion of recent publications ensures that the manuscript is grounded in the latest research, which enhances its credibility and relevance. However, to further strengthen the manuscript, consider adding references from the past two years that address any</p>	

Review Form 3

	emerging trends or recent advancements in the field. This will provide a more comprehensive and up-to-date context for your work.	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION 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 communications. The manuscript is written in a clear and concise manner, with appropriate academic terminology and a logical flow of ideas. The grammar, punctuation, and syntax are mostly accurate, which helps in conveying the research findings effectively. However, a thorough proofreading could further enhance the readability by catching any minor errors or awkward phrasings that might have been overlooked. This will ensure the manuscript meets the highest standards of scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Here are some potential weaknesses of the article:</p> <p>Limited Scope: The study may have a narrow focus, which could limit the generalizability of the findings to broader contexts or different populations.</p> <p>Sample Size: If the sample size is small, it might affect the statistical power of the study and the reliability of the conclusions drawn.</p> <p>Methodological Constraints: Any limitations in the research design, such as lack of control groups or potential biases in data collection, could impact the validity of the results.</p> <p>Literature Review: The literature review might not be comprehensive enough, potentially overlooking key studies that could provide additional context or support for the findings.</p> <p>Data Interpretation: There could be issues with how the data is interpreted, such as overgeneralization of results or failure to consider alternative explanations.</p> <p>Clarity and Readability: While the language quality is generally good, there may be sections that are overly complex or difficult to follow, which could hinder understanding.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayad M.J. Al-Mamoori
Department, University & Country	Iraq