

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123774
Title of the Manuscript:	HETEROTIC STUDIES FOR YIELD AND YIELD ATTRIBUTING CHARACTERS IN FINGER MILLET (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L. Gaertn)
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

Compulsory 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>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.</p>	<p>This journal is a very dynamic for the published research paper of the all scientist and researchers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title of the article, as per research is well good.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract: Dear authors are you written herein the abstract is good, but can you finding here uses of tools will used of breeding prospectus.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Introduction: The introduction paragraph is good written here but written to based on the current research article should be mentioned as per objects & finding hypothetical parameters, which need to be moderate and strictly my suggestion add to past evidences (References). Into the introduction will be finding their future benefits of researchers.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: As per your finding to Materials and methods is good but need to adding in uses of formula of heterosis and attached the evidences of others tools of hypothetical finding.</p> <p>Results and Discussions: The researcher should be written there justified as per formatting of respective publication (JABB). My suggestion, mentioned herein R /D portion to write here need finding in the discussion should be write as per qualitative characters as per research.</p> <p>Conclusion, Acknowledgement should be need to finding & future outlook will need to require moderate.</p> <p>References are to check and moderate as per your finding.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound will very benefited of researchers.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>—</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need to minor correction as per my suggestions.	
Optional/General comments	This research well good for future breeding purposed and will improved of new varieties.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arvind Kumar
Department, University & Country	AISECT University Hazaribag, India