

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121079</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluating Panicle Architecture and Yield Characteristics in Medium Duration Rice Genotypes Through Correlation and Principal Component Analysis</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<b>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.</b>	The content of the article is acceptable and important enough to be highlighted as the alternatives to increase the understanding of increasing quality and quantity of medium duration rice genotypes.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract could be improved, through the detail explanation, especially on the conclusion. It should be written to summarize the results & discussion has been made in the article.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	It is better for the tables or figures to be put right after being mentioned for the first time in the results and discussion.	
<b>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.</b>	Points from the title and objective – gave a good attraction for readers in getting to know the new or alternative findings to improve rice genotype production. However, quite loose explanation from the discussion might loosen the attraction – or at least the author should pay attention more on to answer the objective of the study, and try to elaborate it nicely.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Some of the citation did not include in the reference (red coloured word).	
Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor revision (refer reviewed article)	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shafeeqa Shahrudin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia</b>