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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback: I haven’t used any Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments. |
| **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.** | This manuscript offers a detailed comparison of fresh (plant) and ratoon sugarcane cultivation practices within the actual farm setting of Telangana, India. It examines costs, yields, and profits that can aid in shaping policy, supporting extension services, and providing meaningful guidance to farmers. Considering the importance of sugarcane in India’s agriculture, this research addresses a significant gap by estimating the economic efficiency of ratoon cropping systems within a defined region. The analysis following standard cost concepts (A1–C3) enhances the empirical rigor and replicability of the conclusions drawn. | I sincerely thank the reviewer for the encouraging and insightful comments. I thankful for the recognition of the study’s relevance in evaluating the economic performance of plant and ratoon sugarcane cultivation using standard cost concepts |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title is concise and captures the essence. However, for more global appeal, add region of interest: “Comparative Profitability of Fresh vs. Ratoon Sugarcane Cultivation: A Case Study from Kamareddy, Telangana, India.” | Ok sir/madam but I prefer my title like this as you have suggested I will add the word “comparative” and change my title as “Comparative Profitability of Plant and Ratoon Methods of Sugarcane Cultivation in Kamareddy District of Telangana” |
| 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. | The abstract satisfactorily reports the purposes, methods, and conclusions. Supplement with (1) Major quantitative results (e.g., yield/income gaps), (2) Period of data collection, (3) Implications for policy. | Results and period of data collection is included. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript is scientifically sound. Methodology is well documented and findings are based on common cost accounting and profitability measures in agricultural economics. The results are consistent with the reviewed literature. However, it would be better to address the reasoning as to why 120 farms were sampled and statistically significant differences among profits have not been reported. | I would like to clarify that the sample size for this study was 80 sugarcane (40 plant and 40 ratoon sugarcane farmers), not 120. The results I have got are based on the cost concepts in the methodology I didn’t use any functional analysis for the study. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Adequate but could be improved. There are a bunch of recent references (2017–2025), which is good. Some more references from other Indian states or global literature can be added on ratoon economics of sugarcane for wider ramifications. | Yes , I have few more articles as you mentioned. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript contains numerous grammatical, usage, and awkward phrasing issues. There is need of copyediting for grammatical mistakes. | Yes,,I have rectified. |
| Optional/General comments | Strengths; Field date driven and serves as important and timely reference. Weakness: might need to separate Results and Discussion just to explore why ratoon performed better and discussion does not compare with national/global benchmarks. | However, I will certainly incorporate these improvements in future work to enhansce the depth and broader relevance of the analysis. |
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