

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128899
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Combining Ability and Gene Action in Half Diallel Crosses of Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) genotypes.
Type of the Article	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 (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.	GCA and SCA together provide a comprehensive understanding of the combining ability of parental lines, enabling breeders to make informed decisions. Improved hybrid development: The combined use of GCA and SCA enables breeders to develop high-performing hybrids more efficiently, by identifying the best parental line combinations and predicting hybrid performance. 3. Enhanced breeding efficiency: GCA and SCA together enhance breeding efficiency by reducing the number of crosses required to develop new hybrids, and by increasing the chances of producing high-performing hybrids.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Combining ability studies in Bread Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) crosses	
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.	Comprehensive	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The author is not clear with the design of the crossing system by which they produced the hybrids, which is the core of the experiment.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Recent. References mention in citations is missing in the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality need to be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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:	A. Anisha
Department, University & Country	Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, India