Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_jeai_58018**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Estimation of genetic parameters in early maturing sugarcane clones for yield and quality traits**
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/journal/10/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	Improvements are necessary in the writing up and presentation of findings. I suggest a few graphical support. The use of recent references could greatly contribute to the quality of the work, specially in the introduction and in the discussion of yours results.	Agreed and accepted the comments. However, the results are presented in the well mannered in the tables as well as in the text. If again we are represented same with the graphs is of duplicating data in the paper in another format. So graphical representation only will increase the no. of pages to the article rather than giving any additional information to the reader. We took utmost care in quoting the references of recent years according to the need of our research findings. Additional recent references are not available which are similar / contrast to my research findings.
Minor REVISION comments	In Materials and Methods: Line 2: 2020. Line7: DAP (**000**/ha): I did not understand this zero. I think need values of parameters. This show up in many parts of the text. Brix: line3: Temperature at 20°**C**. Pol: Line3: 4mg? I think is 4 mg. I think references 2 and 3 are incomplete.	Agreed and accepted the comments. The manuscript is revised as per the changes that are suggested by the reviewer in the paper.
Optional/General comments		

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)*	No ethical issues in this manuscript.