Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_92194**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Jaggery yield and nutritional quality as influenced by sugarcane varieties suitable for Andhra Pradesh**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**References.** 1. In the introduction the authors provide statistical data. Maybe there is anything fresher than from 2007 and 2011 years ([3] and [4]) available? 2. Some of the references do not contain doi, although the articles have it. E.g. [14]. For a reader it is easier to find the article with doi. **Experimental part.** 1. Please provide a brief description of the methods from [12] and [13] in the experimental part. These refs are rather old and a quick google check did not find open sources of them. 2. It seems important to mention which reducing sugars were measured (or were in the mixture). 3. It was not described how EC was measured. Probably it could be found in [12] (as it was stated above, not all people have the access to these references). At least, the equipment that the authors used must be mentioned. **Tables.** 1. It is better to avoid abbreviations in the head lines of tables (e.g. EC, table 3). 2. What do the upper-case letters (a,b,c,d,e) and * in the tables 2-4 mean?	
Minor REVISION comments	It would be easier to comprehend the analysis of the data in the Results and Discussion part, if the authors start the discussion of each parameter from the new paragraph.	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Aleksandra Mikhailidi**
Department, University & Country	**St.-Petersburg State University of Industrial Technologies and Design, Russia**