

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129743
Title of the Manuscript:	DUS DESCRIPTORS BASED CHARACTERIZATION OF MAIZE (Zea mays L.) INBRED LINES
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	The article is devoted to a topical issue of studying morphological traits of different inbred maize lines. The use of such maize lines as parental forms can be beneficial for crop breeding. Data on individual traits of different genotypes contribute to the formation of clear schemes for maize breeding in specific directions	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is appropriate	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a good overview of the research topic	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	I consider the manuscript to be scientifically correct.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The authors have cited a sufficient number of scientific sources. However, it would be beneficial to expand the number of recent references. For instance, there are only three references from the last 10 years. A more comprehensive review of recent references would strengthen the overall argument of the paper.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The level of English is sufficient for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article is devoted to a current topic and presents the results of a comprehensive study of morphological traits in specific inbred maize lines. A more detailed discussion of the results would be beneficial to fully appreciate the significance of the work. The inclusion of a statistical analysis would add rigor to the study and enhance the reliability of the conclusions. Furthermore, there are a few minor technical errors present, such as missing spaces. Nevertheless, these do not diminish the importance of the article	

#### **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>Khodanitska Olena</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, Ukraine</b>