

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_124140
Title of the Manuscript:	Gene action and variance of lines and testers for different seedling traits in mulberry ( <i>Morus</i> spp.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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 paper is a great contribution to agriculture, demonstrating increased growth in mulberry using a lines and testers analysis. The research conducted and the findings presented have the potential to advance our understanding of general combining ability and specific combining ability for Mulberry growth traits. The robust methodological approach, thorough data analysis, and thoughtful interpretation of results make this a high-quality and impactful piece of work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The main title should be revised to reflect the content of the article, so I suggest the following modification: Study of gene action and variation in lines and testers for many seedling characteristics in Mulberry (Morus spp.)	
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 should be paraphrased and focus briefly on the article's results.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well organized with appropriate subsections and structure.	
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 presents a well-designed experimental study that closely aligns with established best practices in the field. The theoretical framework is solidly grounded in the relevant literature, and the research questions logically follow from the existing knowledge. The data analysis techniques are appropriate and rigorously applied, and the conclusions drawn are well-supported by the statistical evidence provided.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, the references are rather old and few, so the time sequence must be taken into account when writing the references, as modern references must be available in addition to the old ones.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language requires a simple review in terms of linguistic and spelling errors, as well as the structure of sentences.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction is good in terms of presenting the scientific background necessary for the reader to understand the topic. However, the writing of the introduction can be improved.</li> <li>2. The materials and methods section needs to be reorganized so that it can be divided into separate subsections that include materials used for testing, programs used, work procedures, etc.</li> <li>3. The results and discussion do not have a diagram. Therefore, I suggest adding a figure to the methodology that relates to the topic of the article.</li> <li>4. The discussion needs to be deeper, with more precise and lengthy scientific interpretations of the results obtained, because in its present form, it superficially discusses the results and does not provide a complete scientific explanation. Therefore, considering the discussion is one of the most important parts of the article, it must be given the highest priority and importance.</li> </ol>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Khalid Mohammed Shihab</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Baghdad, Iraq</b>