

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122998
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of heterosis for yield component traits of Pearl Millet (<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br. in pooled environments
Type of the Article	Research article

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)
<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 manuscript addresses the crucial area of enhancing yield in pearl millet through heterosis, a key focus in agricultural research given the crop's significance in arid and semi-arid regions. The study's comprehensive evaluation of various hybrids under different environmental conditions offers valuable insights for breeding programs aimed at improving food security. The identification of promising hybrids like 274A x 123R, which show significant positive heterosis for multiple traits, is particularly noteworthy for developing high-yielding and resilient varieties.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is appropriate and clearly reflects the content and focus of the research. It provides a concise overview of the study's main objective and its application to yield component traits in pearl millet.</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>The abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's aims, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from explicitly stating the significance of the results in broader agricultural contexts. A brief mention of how these findings could influence future breeding strategies would enhance the abstract's impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured, with clearly defined sections that flow logically. The use of subsections within the results and discussion enhances readability and allows for a focused discussion of each trait.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design, involving a line x tester mating design and evaluation across multiple environments, is appropriate for studying heterosis. The statistical analyses are correctly performed and reported, providing strong support for the conclusions drawn. The significant genetic variability observed among the hybrids justifies the identification of superior crosses for yield improvement.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references are sufficient, adequately supporting the study's context and findings. However, some recent references may please be added to discuss the results in more better way. The reference given below along with some recent references may be added to discuss the results.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Das, A. K., Choudhary, M., Kumar, P., Karjagi, C. G., KR, Y., Kumar, R., ... & Rakshit, S. (2021). Heterosis in genomic era: advances in the molecular understanding and techniques for rapid exploitation. Critical reviews in plant sciences, 40(3), 218-242. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but a few sentences require grammatical corrections for clarity. For example, rephrasing in the introduction and results sections could enhance readability.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Santosh Kumar
Department, University & Country	ICAR-IARI, India