

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JABB_125484  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance for Yield and Yield Attributes in Linseed ( <i>Linum usitatissimum L.</i> ) |
| Type of the Article      |   |

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> 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><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>Regarding the importance of the manuscript for the scientific community, this work presents a comprehensive study on the Assessment of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance for Yield and Yield Attributes in Linseed (<i>Linum usitatissimum L.</i>)<br/>However, the manuscript could be improved by including more detailed discussion on the mechanism behind Assessment of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance for Yield and Yield Attributes in Linseed</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>  | <p>The title of the article Assessment of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance for Yield and Yield Attributes in Linseed (<i>Linum usitatissimum L.</i>) is suitable and accurately reflects the main focus on findings.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p>   | <p>The abstract provided for the article outlines the basic structure of the study including its design, methodology, and a brief overview of the results. However, for it to be comprehensive and fully serve its purpose, there are several points that require addition or refinement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective clarification: The abstract not explicitly mention the primary objective of the study. It is crucial to briefly state the research question or objective to provide the reader with a clear understanding of the purpose of the study.</li> <li>2. Introduction : lacks adequate citations I recommend adding some more and current revives</li> <li>3. Specific details on methodology: It lacks specificity regarding the key aspects of the methodology that directly relate to the study's scope. I recommend adding some subheading, these subsections will help structure the content more effectively and allow readers to follow the experimental procedures more easily.</li> <li>4. Results overview: To improve the clarity and organization of the result and discussion section, I recommend adding specific tables in heading including treatments details.</li> <li>5. Conclusion and implications: A brief sentence summarizing the main conclusion and its potential implications for agricultural practices or future research would provide a more rounded and informative</li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>  | <p>The structure and subsections of the manuscript appear to follow a conventional scientific research article layout, including sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. However, there are areas where the structure could be improved for better clarity and coherence. Here are specific suggestions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Subsection of Material and Methods: This section is detailed, covering the experimental design, treatments, and procedures. Subsections would help readers navigate through the information more effectively.</li> <li>2. Additional subsection for Results and Discussion: Integrating the discussion more closely with the results for each treatment, including comparisons with existing literature, would make the findings more impactful. Brief recommendation should be included</li> </ol>  |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <p>RBD design enhances the reliability of the findings by minimizing the effects of confounding variables.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>   | <p>The references listed in the provided text are a mix of relatively recent and older studies, The references are not sufficient, and many of them are outdated.</p> <p>References not well written, and too old</p>   |   |

### Review Form 3

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments<br><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> | The language and English quality of the article provided demonstrate a level of proficiency that is generally suitable for scholarly communications.   |  |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>Lack of objective:</b> I suggest ending the introduction with a sentence that explicitly states the research question or objective.</li></ul> <b>The manuscript is publishable after effecting all the corrections indicated.</b> |  |

### **PART 2:**

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |  |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |                                   |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b>Suryakant Kakasaheb Ugile</b>  |
| Department, University & Country | <b>V.N.M.K.V, Parbhani, India</b> |