

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126736
Title of the Manuscript:	Agro-Morphological Characterization of Maize (Zea mays L.) Landraces from Tribal Blocks of three different Districts of Kashmir
Type of the Article	Scientific research

Scientific research

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
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.	I consider the study of the corn collection important; in this region it plays a big role in the selection of samples adapted to local conditions and characterized by productivity necessary for the selection of this crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I believe that the title of the article is quite suitable for the research carried out to explore the topic.	
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.	The abstract reveals the essence of the written article and the study of research data.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are quite consistent.	
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.	The article is scientifically substantiated by the selection of material and conducted research on agromorphological characteristics, which indicate the future of the selection of samples for sowing and its production.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The article is scientifically substantiated by the selection of material and conducted research on agromorphological characteristics, which indicate the future of the selection of samples for sowing and its production.	
Minor REVISION comments	I am not a native English speaker and cannot fully know its quality.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	There are two sentences: in the article there are two tables, numbered 1 and 2, but they have the same meaning. It is necessary to check the table values or remove the second number. And also the list of references contains 11 sources, thought. Needs to be complemented by more recent research in this area.	

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:	Kushanova Rystay
Department, University & Country	Kazakhstan