

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125835
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Genetic Variability for Yield and Related Traits of Breeding Lines of Cross RNR15048 x Tunga.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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 for the scientific community as it provides valuable data on genetic variability and heritability in rice, crucial for improving crop yields. Drawback of this manuscript is that it lacks clarity in the presentation of results, with some sections being overly technical and not explained well for a broader audience. The introduction does not provide a clear picture of the study's significance or context. Additionally, there is insufficient emphasis on the practical implications of the findings, particularly in relation to regional challenges like climate change, which could have increased its impact. The language used throughout the manuscript could also be improved for better readability and coherence.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>You clarifying the title and the generation being studied. Evaluation of Genetic Variability for Yield and Associated Traits in Breeding Lines Derived from the Cross RNR-15048 x Tunga</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>Use distinct sections (Aims, Study Design, Methodology, Results, Conclusion) and ensure each part flows logically. The aim statement is somewhat vague and does not explicitly convey the research objectives. The results section presents data but lacks interpretation. The conclusion is broad and does not sufficiently highlight the significance of the findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Your manuscript follows a basic structure, but it feels disjointed and lacks a cohesive narrative. Here's a critical look at your structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: This section may need more context and clearer objectives to set the stage effectively. 2. Materials and Methods: The methodology seems standard, but it lacks details that could help replicate the study. Be specific about your statistical methods. 3. Results: This section is overly dense with data presentation and lacks interpretation. Consider breaking it down further or adding subheadings to clarify the findings. 4. Discussion: Without a dedicated discussion section, the implications of your results are lost. This section should analyze the results critically and connect them to the broader context of rice breeding. 	
<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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and overall quality of English in the article require significant improvement to meet the standards of scholarly communication. Here are some observations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Grammatical Errors: There are several grammatical mistakes, such as missing articles and improper verb tenses, which can confuse readers and detract from the professionalism of the manuscript. Awkward Phrasing: Some sentences are poorly constructed, leading to awkward phrasing that affects clarity. For example, phrases like "indicating that selection will be successful" could be better articulated for smoother reading. Clarity and Conciseness: Certain sections are overly complex and could be simplified. For instance, the introduction includes multiple ideas packed into one long sentence, making it challenging for readers to follow. Consistency in Terminology: There are inconsistencies in the terminology used for traits, which could confuse readers. Ensuring consistent use of terms throughout the manuscript will enhance clarity. Technical Terminology: While some technical terms are appropriately used, they may need clearer definitions or explanations to ensure accessibility for a broader audience. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, while the manuscript presents valuable research, addressing these aspects could further enhance its quality and impact in the field of rice breeding and genetics.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Deepak Gupta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Sri Karan Narendra Agriculture University, India</p>