

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124384
Title of the Manuscript:	Tandur Jonna 1: A Rabi Sorghum variety for deep black soils of Telangana
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	The development of Tandur Jonna 1 (SVT 68) is significant for the scientific community as it demonstrates advancements in breeding for dual-purpose sorghum varieties with improved yields, disease resistance, and enhanced nutrient content. This contributes to sustainable agriculture and offers a model for addressing both food security and livestock feed needs in semi-arid regions. The duration of the experiment is too long to be comprehended in a single research paper. So paper needs MAJOR REVISION	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is not suitable. Following title can be considered. "Performance Evaluation and Release of High-Yielding Dual-Purpose Rabi Sorghum Culture 'Tandur Jonna 1' (SVT 68) for Cultivation in Telangana"	
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, while comprehensive in its description, covers an extended study period from 2007 to 2021, which is unusually long for a single research project. This extended timeframe might dilute the focus and raise questions about the consistency of methodology, environmental conditions, and trial management over the years. It would be beneficial to either emphasize the division of the study into clear phases or consider breaking the study into smaller, more manageable sub-studies to reflect the progression from breeding to multi-location trials and eventual release.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Given the extended study period from 2007 to 2021, it would be more appropriate to break the study into 2-3 distinct research papers, each focusing on different phases of the research process. This approach allows for a more detailed presentation of methods, results, and discussions, making each paper more focused and impactful.	
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.	By breaking the study into three research papers, you maintain a logical flow and ensure that each phase of the research is thoroughly documented and published in an appropriate forum. Paper 1: Development and Breeding of a High-Yielding Dual-Purpose Rabi Sorghum Culture (2007-2013) Paper 2: Evaluation of Grain and Fodder Yield Performance of SVT 68 in Station Trials and Multi-location AICRP Trials (2014-2019) Paper 3: On-Farm Trials and Farmer Participatory Evaluation of Tandur Jonna 1 (SVT 68): Minikit Trials and General Release (2019-2021)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. Revision of the paper will help adding especially recent and relevant studies that will validate the claims and provide a strong foundation for the article.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally clear, but there are a few areas where the phrasing could be improved to enhance its suitability for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	no

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Priyanka Choudhary
Department, University & Country	Banaras Hindu University, India