

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_119821
Title of the Manuscript:	Study on Genetic Variability for Forage Yield and Quality Traits in Forage Sorghum [Sorghum bicolor L. Moench]
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. The authors deployed statistical tools, using ANOVA, in the field of agriculture, to study different germplasm lines of sorghum and therefore evaluate the quality by ranking germplasms.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive. However, instead of giving results, they ought to introduce the field of application generally, then, explaining the problematic, the frame of the study, the research gap (compared to the existing ones) to highlight the contribution.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct (formula, results, analysis).</p> <p>6. The references aren't sufficient and recent. The authors are invited to add recent references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are mistakes in: Abstract: program Key words: heritability Formula C: heritability On page 5: ith</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Explain all the abbreviations mentioned in the abstract. Page 5: "General mean, range of variability and best top 10 germplasm" (turn it to size 12). As a perspective, the authors can use Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis methods since it concerns a ranking problematic. Example : ARAS, EDAS, CODAS...</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maroua Ghram
Department, University & Country	Higher Institute of Business Administration of Sfax, Tunisia