

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
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	

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.	The manuscript presents the development and evaluation of the little millet variety DHLM-36-3-1, which is significant for the scientific and agricultural communities. This variety addresses critical agricultural challenges by enhancing yield, disease tolerance, and nutritional quality, making it a valuable asset for sustainable millet production. The meticulous trials and statistical evaluations strengthen the manuscript's credibility, highlighting its potential to improve food security, particularly in rainfed areas. I appreciate this manuscript's thorough approach to breeding and the detailed data provided, which offer a well-supported case for DHLM-36-3-1's role in integrated pest and crop management.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Suggested Title- "Advancements in Little Millet (<i>Panicum Sumetrense</i> .L.) Breeding: Characterization of DHLM-36-3-1 and DHLM-14-1 for yield improvement and Disease Tolerance"	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it provides comprehensive data derived from multi-year trials, rigorous breeding techniques, and extensive evaluation against national checks. The authors demonstrate scientific correctness by detailing the breeding process for DHLM-36-3-1, clearly outlining the variety's superior yield, pest resistance, and nutritional benefits compared to established benchmarks. Statistical analyses and comparative metrics (such as incremental yield percentages and resistance rates) lend credibility to the findings, underscoring the variety's adaptability to diverse agro-climatic conditions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Terms like 'proposed variety' and 'newly developed variety' should be described, only one of these terms should be used in the manuscript and properly explained in which context these terms are used.	
Optional/General comments	captions and table contents of table-2 and table-4 are mismatched spellings and grammatical mistakes should be corrected	

Review Form 3

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:	Sunita Rawat
Department, University & Country	Government Degree College, C.S.J.M. University, India