

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_123959
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the adaptability and yield performance of Released Sesame varieties in Western Tigray, Northern Ethiopia
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	I would reject this paper because the tables lack clarity. Important statistical details, like (ANOVA) LSD values and significance levels, are not well explained. The lack of clarity in the tables affects the overall understanding of the study's results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Evaluation of Released Sesame Varieties for Yield and Adaptability in Western Tigray, Ethiopia" this title could be better	
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>The abstract of the article is informative but these changes improve the article. These line could enhance the scope of study.</p> <p>Suggestions for addition</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "Sesame is an important crop for Ethiopia's economy, and identifying high-yielding varieties is crucial for increasing productivity in low-performing areas like Western Tigray. 2. The abstract mentions the experimental setup (randomized complete block design) but doesn't give the type of data collected. 3. Simplifying and summarizing the key outcomes, without listing too many numbers, would make it easier to read. For example , The study found that the varieties Setit-2, Setit-1 and Humera-1 performed the best with Setit-2 producing the highest grain yield of 1111.89 kg/ha. These varieties outperformed others in terms of yield, making them suitable for cultivation in the study area. Based on the results, Setit-2 is recommended for farmers in Western Tigray due to its high yield potential and adaptability. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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 ANOVA table is missing, which is important for showing the statistical analysis. If different locations were used, the interactions between genotype and environment (GxE) should also be shown in a table. Currently, the table only presents the mean values for the 9 varieties, which isn't enough. While the post hoc test and LSD are appropriate, without first explaining the ANOVA table, the results don't make much sense.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	<p>Reference format are need to be check again. These are not in line with guidelines.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The references are diverse and cover many relevant aspects of sesame cultivation. 2. A larger inclusion of recent studies (from 2018-2023) is suggested to enhance the recency of the literature. 3. Consider adding studies on global sesame yield performance, genetic improvement, and environmental impacts. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Needs improvement in language clarity. There are some long sentences in introduction and conclusion part which needed to breakdown	
Optional/General comments	In Methodology, Correlation analysis is noted. But results, tables are not included	

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:	J Sankar
Department, University & Country	Don Bosco College of Agriculture, India