

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130017
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic parameters in germplasm lines for yield and its contributing traits in grain amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into identifying the some of the promising genotypes which can be used in further breeding program for improvement of amaranth crop and benefiting breeders and researchers working on the amaranths.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Genetic Analysis of Germplasm Lines for Yield and Yield-Related Traits in Grain Amaranth (<i>Amaranthus hypochondriacus</i> L.) it is generally appropriate for the content described in the manuscript. However, you might consider minor adjustments to make it more concise or reflective of key findings	
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 of the article is generally comprehensive, but there are some areas that could be refined for clarity, conciseness, and completeness. Here are some suggestions: The conclusion part in the abstract can be improved.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically correct overall. Check all the citation or references given it is not in the correct format	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references seem not sufficient and could benefit from more recent studies and some references are missing the content One references is duplicated	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas for improvement. Some sentences could be simplified for clarity and flow. Grammar issues, such as missing articles and subject-verb agreement, should be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	Based on the provided excerpts, there don't appear to be any competing interest issues mentioned. However, potential conflicts should be disclosed, such as funding sources, author affiliations, or product endorsements. If no conflicts exist, a statement confirming "The authors declare no competing interests" should be included in the manuscript. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	G.Nehru
Department, University & Country	Acharaya N G Ranga Agricultural University (ANGRAU), India