

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_102073</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Unravelling the Genetic Enigma: Exploring the Molecular Basis of Heterosis</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### 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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly for molecular level breeding schemes</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The title of the manuscript/article is suitable and can be complement of the research work to be conducted for the near future</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Abstract part of the paper is more of comprehensive, except background part (rationale of the study)</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate according to my assessments</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct and meaningful</b></li> <li>➤ <b>The references for this paper are more or less sufficient but try to incorporate recently promoted or published references to make more updated</b></li> </ul>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For scholarly communications, the quality of English language throughout the manuscript is very good and can be understandable by any person around the scientific community</li> </ul>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ None</li> </ul>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Zeru Yimer Kebede</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research, Ethiopia</b>