

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126566
Title of the Manuscript:	Breeding for Pest and Disease Tolerance high yielding Variety (DHLM-36-3-1) in Little Millet ( <i>Panicum sumetrense</i> . L).
Type of the Article	Research paper

### 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is based on fieldwork to "Pest and disease tolerance variety of Little Millet (<i>Panicum sumetrense</i>. L)". and I want to look at the following changes from the author as; the manuscript needs to be revised carefully for the improvement in language and discussion about the methodology. This manuscript can be accepted after revision.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Specify the criteria for yield stability and homozygosity (e.g., metrics or methods used) and indicate how many lines were evaluated.</li> <li>2. Clarify the specifics of the local and national checks (e.g., names or characteristics of check varieties) and provide information on trial design (e.g., randomized block design, number of replications).</li> <li>3. Specify screening conditions: Were screenings conducted in the field, lab, or greenhouse?</li> <li>4. Clearly define the criteria used to assess disease severity and tolerance (e.g., scoring systems or disease scales).</li> <li>5. Mention how often plants were assessed for each pest or disease?</li> <li>6. How often were plants assessed for each pest or disease?</li> </ol> <p>Further comments are added through track changes; carefully follow the instruction for the better of your manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Issues found in Language quality – readability Readability suggestions cover issues like conciseness, redundancy, transition and flow, and suggests improved phrasing. I have identified issues in reviewed manuscript.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asad Rajput
Department, University & Country	Sindh Agriculture University, Pakistan