

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124321
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Autogamous and Self-fertile lines in Sunflower (<i>Helianthus annuus</i> L.) over seasons.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<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 important because it explores how seasonal variations affect sunflower breeding, focusing on autogamy and self-fertility. The findings can help breeders develop better-performing sunflower varieties suited to specific seasons.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title is Good and clear for research article</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 is mostly comprehensive but can be improved by,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adding the objective at the start for clarity (e.g., "This study aims to assess..."). 2. Including key statistical results (e.g., seed set percentages). 3. Highlighting implications for breeding, focusing on how the findings help improve sunflower hybrids. You can also simplify the description of seasonal effects and briefly summarize the pollination methods to make the abstract more concise. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate for a research article. The key sections—Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion</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>This manuscript is scientifically sound because it uses a clear and structured research methodology. The study examines 46 sunflower genotypes, which ensures a broad and reliable analysis. Different pollination methods are compared, providing comprehensive insights into seed set and self-fertility. The statistical analysis, like ANOVA, confirms the significance of the results. But, ANOVA table was not included, it must included in the article. Overall, the study is thorough and provides useful data for sunflower breeding programs.</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 are relevant but mostly older, with few recent studies. Adding more recent papers from the last 5 years on sunflower breeding and autogamy would strengthen the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	the article is mostly suitable for academic publication and minor grammatical revisions are recommended to enhance its clarity	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How was the analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed? What were the factors included in the model (e.g., season, genotype, pollination method)? Were interactions between factors examined?2. What significance level (α) was chosen for the study, and why? Is it appropriately conservative (e.g., 0.05) for this type of research?3. How the sample size (15 plants per treatment) is determined?4. Were the environmental conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity) during the Kharif and Rabi seasons systematically recorded?5. The results appear promising, but the paper lacks clear reporting of p-values, confidence intervals, or effect sizes. Could you include these in your analysis?6. Table needs to be separated based on seasons, anova table must be included in the study and environment data also included in the table.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sankar J
Department, University & Country	Don Bosco College of Agriculture, India