

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125052
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of genetic parameters among its components in Indian mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.)
Type of the 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)
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.	This manuscript explores genetic parameters in Indian mustard, which is essential for understanding crop improvement. However, studying only 12 genotypes limits the study's value for large-scale crop improvement. The results from such a limited sample size may not provide sufficient genetic diversity to draw broad conclusions, which reduces its impact on the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title does not reflect the content of the manuscript. Although "Association of genetic parameters" is mentioned in the title, it is not covered in the materials & methods or results & discussion sections. The title should be revised to better align with the focus of the study. Suggested Title: "Evaluation of Genetic Parameters for Yield Traits in Indian Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) Genotypes"	
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 does not comprehensively represent the study. Key aspects such as the absence of character association analysis, which is mentioned in the introduction, should be addressed. Additionally, the abstract could be expanded to better describe the statistical findings and their implications for breeding.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is generally sound, but there is a major inconsistency: the character association study is not discussed in the materials & methods or results & discussion sections, even though it is highlighted in the introduction. This disconnect weakens the manuscript's overall coherence.	
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.	While the methods employed are scientifically correct, the limited number of genotypes and the missing character association analysis reduce the manuscript's scientific robustness. The study needs a larger sample size and a more thorough discussion on the genetic variability and correlations among traits to be considered significant in the field of crop improvement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references seem adequate, but the work would benefit from including more recent studies.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Scientific Names: The scientific names (e.g., <i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) are not consistently written in italics, which should be corrected. Language: Improve sentence structure for clarity and address grammatical issues, such as missing articles.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript lacks the depth required for significant contributions to crop improvement, especially with such a limited set of genotypes. The authors should consider revising the scope of their study or increasing the number of genotypes for a more comprehensive analysis. Additionally, it is crucial to include the character association study mentioned in the title and introduction.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asit Prasad Dash
Department, University & Country	S'O'A (DU), India