

**Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                               |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>                                                             |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJPSS_88028                                                                                                                |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Evaluation of Early Maturing Sugarcane Clones for Yield, Quality and Its Contributing Traits in East Coast Zone of Tamil Nadu |
| 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) |
|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | -The results were very interesting and corroborated with the literature. However, the author (s) left something to be desired in the discussion of the results. They could have explored the discussion better, emphasizing the importance of this study, for example. |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | -The work is interesting and compatible at the level of the journal.                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    | -All information on the work was understandable and consistent with each other.                                                                                                                                                                                        |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**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) |                                                                                                                                                                               |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                           |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | Renisson Neponuceno de Araújo Filho       |
| Department, University & Country | Universidade Federal do Tocantins, Brazil |