

Reviewer's comments

Line 8: remove "even"

Line 10 replace "this issue" with "increase yield"

Line 11 remove "for selection of genotypes"

Line 14-15 remove "during the period"

Line 17 about 60 "what?" give the units??

Line 25 yield of what "sugarcane or sugar or biomass" , be specific

Line 27 replace "these" with "other"

Line 36 "replace" technique with method

Line 77 Is it the number of buds was standardised at 150 per plot??

Line 84 and 85 replace "for" with "to"

Line 88 these are sugarcane stalk characters

Line 130-131 must be independent and dependent variables

Line 162 replace canes with stalks throughout paper

Line 189 replace either with "one"

Lines 185-192 confusing. You remove one of two variables that are correlated to address multicollinearity not both as is being suggested in the paragraph. Please correct and make clear.

Line 244-249 what are the units for genetic advance values??

Line 262 replace ">" with words

Overall comments

The major weakness of the paper is in the results and discussion section. This section largely presents the results with very little or no discussion. The authors need to address this weakness. The discussion should highlight the meaning of the results presented as well as put that meaning in context of previous research done on selection indices on sugarcane and other crops. Very little attempt has been done in the manuscript.

For example the meaning of the phenotypic and genotypic character association need to be explained. The importance of doing multicollinearity tests as well as the meaning of the test results need to be explained to improve understanding of the readers. At the same time, the application of these results need to be explained especially how the correction of the multicollinearity helped improve the selection indices.