

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_129707 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Combining Ability Analysis based on Line x Tester Mating Design in Wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) |
| Type of the Article | |

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. | This manuscript is significant to the scientific community because it sheds light on wheat's genetic diversity and combining capacity, both of which are critical for increasing crop yields. Breeding initiatives aimed at creating high-performing wheat varieties can directly benefit from the discovery of potential parental lines and better hybrids. These findings are useful for tackling productivity issues and guaranteeing food security in light of the rising worldwide demand for food. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes, the title of the article is suitable as it effectively reflects the content and scope of the study. | |
| 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, the abstract is comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, there are a few minor grammar mistakes that need correction for improved readability. For example Sentence: "The experiment, conducted at the Research Farm of BRD PG College during the 2021-2022 rabi season, assessed 13 agronomic traits, including plant height, days to flowering, biological yield, and grain yield, using a randomized block design (RBD) with three replications." Issue: Slight redundancy with "using" appearing twice. Correction: "The experiment, conducted at the Research Farm of BRD PG College during the 2021-2022 rabi season, assessed 13 agronomic traits, including plant height, days to flowering, biological yield, and grain yield, in a randomized block design (RBD) with three replications." Sentence: "SCA analysis highlighted hybrids like PBW-502 x DBW-187 and SR-303 x PBW-667 as superior for traits such as early flowering, plant height, and grain yield." Issue: The word "like" could be better replaced with "such as" in scientific writing for precision. Correction: "SCA analysis highlighted hybrids such as PBW-502 x DBW-187 and SR-303 x PBW-667 as superior for traits including early flowering, plant height, and grain yield." | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | I observed that the introduction is relatively brief, with only 187 words. I recommend expanding it to at least 350 words to provide readers with more comprehensive background information on the topic. This will help to better contextualize the study and highlight its significance in the field. Additionally, including figures or graphs to present key results visually would enhance the manuscript's clarity and impact, making it easier for readers to interpret the findings. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are generally sufficient and recent, providing a solid foundation for the study. However, one reference, <i>Kempthorne, O. (1957). An Introduction to Genetic Statistics</i> , appears outdated. I recommend replacing it with more recent sources to ensure the manuscript reflects the current state of research in the field. | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, I recommend running the manuscript through Grammarly or a similar tool to catch any minor errors and ensure the language is polished. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Name: | Usama Yaseen |
| Department, University & Country | Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia |