

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120913
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance in maize (Zea mays L.) inbred lines
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a detailed analysis of topic, shedding light on previously unexplored aspects and offering novel insights. The rigorous methodology and comprehensive data set enhance the robustness and reliability of the findings, making it a valuable resource for further research and application</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article appears to be suitable as it effectively captures the main focus and scope of the research. It is concise yet informative, giving potential readers a clear idea of what to expect from the content. A well-chosen title can significantly enhance the article's visibility and impact within the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it effectively summarizes the key points of the research, including the background, methodology, findings, and conclusions. It provides a clear overview of the study's objectives and the significance of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate as they provide a logical flow and ensure the information is presented in a clear and organized manner. The division into introduction, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion helps readers navigate through the manuscript easily. Each section focuses on specific aspects of the research, which contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the study</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous methodology, thorough data analysis, and clear presentation of results. The authors have employed well-established techniques and have provided sufficient detail to ensure reproducibility of the experiments. The data is analyzed using appropriate statistical methods, ensuring that the conclusions drawn are based on solid evidence. Additionally, the discussion section thoughtfully addresses potential limitations and places the findings within the context of existing literature, further reinforcing the manuscript's scientific robustness and technical soundness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be both sufficient and recent. The authors have cited a comprehensive range of relevant studies. Most of the references are from recent years, indicating that the authors have incorporated the latest research findings into their study. This enhances the manuscript's credibility and relevance to current scientific discourse.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is written in clear and precise English, with technical terms appropriately used and explained. Sentences are well-structured, and the overall flow of the text is logical and coherent. There are no significant grammatical or syntactical errors that would impede understanding. This ensures that the research is communicated effectively to the scientific community.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Lang Thi Nguyen
Department, University & Country	High Agricultural Technology Research Institute for Mekong delta, Vietnam