

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_120575</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of Drought Tolerance in Rabi Sorghum Genotypes Under Polyethylene Glycol-Induced Osmotic Stress</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. It presents the results of the experiment for the evaluation of drought tolerance in 20 sorghum varieties under polyethylene glycol-induced osmotic stress, by the analysis of the following physiological parameter: germination percentage, root and shoot length, seedling dry weight, and seedling vigor indices. The results indicate that some of these varieties perform well in drought conditions and could be the basis for the selection of drought-tolerant sorghum varieties in the study area	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	From my point of view, the manuscript is scientifically correct. In general, it respects the rules of the art of scientific writing. Nevertheless, the number of scientific sources needs to be improved.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The number of references can be improved by sources less than 10 years old	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

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

### Review Form 3

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Illiassou Naroua</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Boubakar Bâ de Tillabéri, Niger</b>