

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_128707
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Pearl Millet Hybrids, Parents and their Performance in Hybrids against Blast Disease under Field Conditions
Type of the 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: 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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Out of 66 genotypes authors have screened out 25 genotypes and 13 were found moderately resistant having one race the female, 10 hybrids and 2 as male. In case of hybrids, we categorized the combinations based on type of cross viz., resistant x resistant = resistant (21), resistant x susceptible = resistant (9), susceptible x resistant = susceptible (14) and susceptible x susceptible = susceptible (6) recorded the blast score (score 1.0 to 5.0 consideration as resistance reaction and 5.1 to 9 consider as susceptible reaction. Study model was quite good. Total hybrids, 19 hybrids were found to be highly resistant, one was hybrid found resistant, 10 were hybrids found moderately resistant, 20 hybrids were found susceptible and none of the hybrid was found highly susceptible to blast.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES	
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.	YES	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	YES	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Add some reference. Paper is worth publishing as such.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rama Shankar
Department, University & Country	Ayurveda Regional Research Institute (CCRAS) Itanagar, India