



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_35691
Title of the Manuscript:	Interrelationship patterns among cane yield attributes and physiological traits in sugarcane under normal and water stress conditions
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	1. Authors have not followed the guidelines for the journal. 2. Line number 58: 12 local elite clones, only 11 have been mentioned. 3. Line number 71: Full form of NMC not mentioned. 4. Line number 74-77: the sentence is incomplete. 5. Line number 133-134: In the same sentence 'both the environments' written twice. 6. Line number 140: E1 and E2, numbers have to subscripts. 7. Line number 171: It should be germination percentage. 8. Line number 198: 'single cane weight (0.385)' repeated twice. 9. Line number 217: 'number' repeated twice. 10. No uniformity in writing references, names of some journals are short forms and others full names of journals. 11. In the text also there is no uniformity in writing references. E.g.: Some places 'et al' is italicized at other places it is not. 12. Journal's guideline says: references have to appear at the end in order it appears in the text, however here it is alphabetical order.	1. Revised as per journal guidelines 2. Clone name added (CoPb 13183) 3. All comments of esteemed reviewer are well taken and incorporated in the article and marked in yellow colour for you ready reference pl.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1. Authors need to follow the guidelines which are specified for the journal. 2. Authors have tried to put too much of work in one paper, which makes it confusing.	Needful done