

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_102036
Title of the Manuscript:	Agro-morphological performances of M3 generation of irradiated maize developing against the Fall Armyworm in Central African Republic
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. No, the title of the article is not suitable. Title suggestion: Agro-morphological performance of M3 generation of irradiated maize in Central African Republic. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. It's just that the author needs to revise the results section, so that the results can be in sync with the discussion. I recommend that in the results chapter the author shows only the most prominent research results. For example, the observations found on the CMS8501 variety were still able to grow and produce seeds at a dose of 500 Gy. Then in the discussion section, the author discusses what is wrong with these varieties? The author should also improve the diagrams in the manuscript so that readers can easily understand them. Also pay attention to the template requested by the journal. Double-check for typo errors in the manuscript. Research and writing of manuscripts are in accordance with the rules of scientific writing. Yes, the author has used the latest references and is in accordance with the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please pay attention again to typo errors in the text. I found a lot of double or more spaces between sentences and even between words in one sentence. The difference in type and size of letters is also very visible. It seems that the author has not followed the writing template required by the journal.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Apri Sulisty
Department, University & Country	Indonesia