

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
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**

<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.	The work aimed to assess the hybrid vigour for yield and its components in finger millet. Furthermore, it will be important for identifying the best parent and crosses with high heterosis in order to integrate in the program improvement.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable. I have no suggestions relatively to the title proposed by authors	
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.	Indicate in the abstract the experimental design and software using for statistical analyses	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript were appropriate. But some incoherence's were noted nnamely: Introduction: this section had no reference appropriate to each sentence. Scientifically, there have previous studies relating the yield and yield attributing traits in finger millet. Write the scientific names in italic Authors must be the production level in recent years. Additionally, in this section it noted that the following sentence translate why? "....suggesting the easiest ways of commercial exploitation of genetic potential of wheat crops" What the relation between wheat crops and finger millet? Authors must be explained clearly the idea. Further, authors can focused on more previous works carrying out on yield and its components in finger millet. Materials and Methods: Detailed the characteristics of soil properties, climate intersected site of research work undertaken. Authors had done the emasculation. Thus, described the method which used. Detailed the method used in order to evaluate yield grain and its components. The magnitude of heterosis was estimated over mid parent, better parent and standard check. Mentioned the relevant formula for assessment the heterosis and heterobeltiosis. Results and discussion: After doing ANOVA, it would be crucial to discuss with previous studies done in finger millet. Why don't you do the ANOVA only for the seven parents? It is more precise to reveal the diversity observed among the lines and testers used and compared them. Conclusion: This section does not exist. Authors must be indicated if the objectives were reached.	
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 was robust and technically sound. Though could be referring to the suggestions aforementioned.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References must be completed	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**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>Aladji Abatchoua Madi Madi Ibram</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Yaoundé 1, Cameroon</b>