

### Review Form 3

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JEAI_123222   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | HETEROTIC STUDIES FOR YIELD AND ITS RELATED TRAITS IN PEARL MILLET ( <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> ( L.) R. Br.) |
| Type of the Article      |  |

#### PART 1: Review Comments

| <b>Compulsory</b> 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.                        | This manuscript is very important for the scientific community. Especially for those involved in breeding programs of pearl millet. It is beneficial to breeders, farmers and those in the agricultural sectors.                                     |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable?<br>(If not please suggest an alternative title)   | Yes, the title is suitable, but I suggest that it is re-written as follows:<br><br>HETEROTIC STUDIES FOR YIELD IN PEARL MILLET ( <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> ( L.) R. Br.)<br>AND ITS RELATED TRAITS.  |   |
| 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.   | I suggest the following edits:<br>Write rajendranagar and Hyderabad with first letters capitalized.<br>Write ANOVA in full then put the abbreviation in brackets.<br>For Keywords, please add these: Pearl millet, <i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> , India |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | No, the conclusion section is missing.   |   |
| 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. | This manuscript is scientifically correct. The results in tables etc are justifying this and make the manuscript scientifically robust.  |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | Yes, references are sufficient.  |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?   | Yes, it is suitable.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | Please provide explanations of the information in all the tables.  |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Faith Fransisca Kavishe</b>                                |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Namibia University of Science and Technology, Tanzania</b> |