

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117745
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking the genetic potential by assessing combining ability and heterosis for yield and its component traits in sunflower (<i>Helianthus annuus</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The line x tester method is a common breeding approach for assessment of lines/accessions for their combining ability and heterosis. It helps to explore the genetic potential of breeding lines for its utilization in crop improvement program. Hence, the manuscript is relevant and may be considered for publication provided necessary changes and correction is done as highlighted in the reviewed manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, the title is appropriate</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are satisfactory. More recent references, if available can be included.</p> <p>The manuscript needed corrections. All those points should be appropriately addressed as highlighted in the comment box. Few queries need to be address like 'what is the standard check taken to determine the standard heterosis? It should be mentioned in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, language is suitable for communications. Few portions in the paragraphs have been corrected. Still unnecessary sentences can be avoided to reduce the number of words (word counts)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript can be considered for publication provided necessary corrections should be done.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Abhinav Jain
Department, University & Country	India