

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_100202
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATING GENETIC COEFFICIENTS OF SORGHUM CULTIVARS USING GENCALC AND GLUE GENETIC COEFFICIENT ESTIMATORS IN DSSAT
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>The research manuscript was important to the scientific community, unfortunately, the report did not answer the research statement of problem. Moreover, relevance, aim, and objectives were not clearly mentioned</b></p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b></p> <p>3. <b>The abstract was brief and clear.</b></p> <p>4. <b>Insufficient information to complete structure and subsections, see the manuscript for corrections.</b></p> <p>5. <b>Incomplete data to justify scientific relevance, see the manuscript for corrections</b></p> <p>6. <b>References are sufficient but should be arranged according to journal's instruction</b></p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Fix grammatical issues Check and formatted the punctuation</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Follow author guidelines</p>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emoleila Itoandon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Almon Research Foundation, India</b>