

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123765
Title of the Manuscript:	Rootstocks affects vine growth, cane storage and yield in Crimson Seedless grapevine
Type of the Article	Research paper

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides critical insights into the role of rootstocks in enhancing the growth, biochemical composition, and yield of Crimson Seedless grapevines. By highlighting the specific advantages of rootstocks like Dogridge and 140Ru, the study offers practical implications for optimizing grapevine performance, particularly in terms of nutrient storage and yield improvement. The findings are valuable for viticulturists and researchers seeking sustainable practices to enhance vine productivity. I appreciate this manuscript because it systematically links rootstock selection with key growth parameters and biochemical traits, offering a clear roadmap for improving colored grape cultivars.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>No</b>  <b>"Influence of Different Rootstocks on Vine Growth, Cane Storage, and Yield in Crimson Seedless Grapevine"</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b>            The study investigated the influence of different rootstocks (Dogridge, 110R, 140Ru, and 1103P) on vine growth, cane storage, and yield in Crimson Seedless grapevines during 2021-22 and 2022-23 at ICAR-NRC Grapes, Pune. Growth parameters, including pruned biomass, leaf area, and stock: scion ratio, were significantly impacted by the rootstocks, with Dogridge rootstock recording the highest values. Dogridge also resulted in greater shoot length, shoot diameter, and minimum internodal length. Cane biochemical content, such as total phenol, tannin, proline, and carbohydrates, was highest in vines grafted on Dogridge, while 1103P rootstock showed the highest cane protein levels. Yield parameters, including average bunch weight and yield per vine, were superior in vines grafted on Dogridge. The study concluded that Dogridge rootstock significantly enhanced cane storage, biochemical composition, and yield, making it a suitable choice for Crimson Seedless grapevines in tropical conditions.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Applicable</b></p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it employs a well-structured experimental design using randomized block design (RBD) with appropriate replication, ensuring reliable and reproducible results. The methods for biochemical analysis, such as the Folin-Ciocalteu method for phenols and the Anthrone method for carbohydrates, are widely accepted and standardized, which adds credibility to the findings. Furthermore, the data is analyzed using statistical tools like ANOVA, which accurately assesses the significance of the results. The comprehensive approach and adherence to established scientific protocols strengthen the validity of the conclusions drawn in the study.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p><b>No, There is need to add more reference</b></p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor revision and suitable for communication	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Anupam Adarsh</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nalanda College of Horticulture, Bihar Agricultural University, India</b>