

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124020
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Genotypic and Phenotypic Relationships and Their Impact on Yield Traits of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.)
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

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.	➤ Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly for Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) future improvement. This particular study paves the way for other programs to promote more the crop with appropriate packages.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	➤ The title of the manuscript/article is suitable and can be complement of the research work conducted on the crop (Brinjal)	
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.	➤ Abstract part of the paper is more of comprehensive, except background part (rationale of the study)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	➤ Yes, sub-sections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate according to my observations	
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 is scientifically correct and meaningful with directions	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	➤ The references for this paper are more or less sufficient but try to incorporate recently available or published references to make more updated	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	➤ For scholarly communications, the quality of English language throughout the manuscript is very good and can be understandable by any person around the scientific community	
Optional/General comments	➤ None	

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:	Zeru Yimer Kebede
Department, University & Country	Pawe Agricultural Research Center (PARC), Ethiopia