

Journal Name:	<a href="#"><u>PLANT CELL BIOTECHNOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY</u></a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_PCBMB_12579</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Physio- biochemical and molecular changes associated with waterlogging stress in sugarcane: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review</b>

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This review MS highlights the impact of waterlogging stress in sugarcane and based on literature available on it. Furthermore, it will provide an overview on stress occurred in eastern India due to water stagnation in sugarcane.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Title is suitable and ok.	

<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>In abstract the background of the study is heavily highlighted but it lacks in what this review is focused on followed by a conclusion.</p>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<p>It needs the following corrections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is very short and not displaying the whole story of the review. Rewrite it by elaborating it.</li> <li>2. In fig. 1 and 2 remove the figure effect and frame. Provide a more clear high quality photographs with their source.</li> <li>3. Provide original figure for fig. 7 and cite the source in text.</li> <li>4. Add the sources for Table 1-4.</li> <li>5. In table 5-7 and whole MS, write chlorophyll instead of “chl”.</li> <li>6. Add the source of Table 10, 11 and 13.</li> <li>7. In the subheading “Influence of Waterlogging on Yield and Quality attributes”: Support it with the relevant references. Link of paper is as under: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <a href="https://doi.org/10.59797/ija.v69i2.5506">https://doi.org/10.59797/ija.v69i2.5506</a></li> <li>b. <a href="https://doi.org/10.59797/ija.v63i1.5385">https://doi.org/10.59797/ija.v63i1.5385</a></li> <li>c. <a href="https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370873538_Growth_Yield_and_Quality_Assessment_of_Sugarcane_Saccharum_officinarum_L_Varieties_under_Waterlogged_Conditions">https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370873538_Growth_Yield_and_Quality_Assessment_of_Sugarcane_Saccharum_officinarum_L_Varieties_under_Waterlogged_Conditions</a></li> </ol> </li> <li>8. “Tiller Production”: It should be supported with more relevant references like <a href="https://thebioscan.com/index.php/pub/article/view/1474/1419">https://thebioscan.com/index.php/pub/article/view/1474/1419</a></li> <li>9. Future prospects should be added before conclusion.</li> <li>10. Conclusion should be rewritten in brief.</li> </ol>	
<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>Partly. Some of the current references of 2023 and 2024 can be added as suggested earlier.</p>	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<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>Navnit Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>RPCAU, India</b>