

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_130469
Title of the Manuscript:	Agronomic Performance of Premium Quality Advanced Breeding Lines of Indica Rice
Type of the Article	Research

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 research work gives an account of growth and yield performance of a few premium quality advanced breeding lines. These advanced lines can be included in the variety development pipeline to release a variety.	
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.	The abstract has to be drafted again with proper English. Names to the statistical methods used must be clearly mentioned in the abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Experiment planned is scientific but the way in which the manuscript is drafted makes it unscientific. Very poor, unscientific statements have been used, specially in the Conclusion section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most of the references are out dated, older than a decade. The authors must re-draft the manuscript with latest references, not older than 2020. Additional, in certain statements, references must be added. I have mentioned/ highlighted such parts in the manuscript itself	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English used is very poor. Most of the sentences fail to convey the information. I suggest the authors to revise the manuscript with aid of a professional or with help of software/ tools available for the same.	
Optional/General comments	I Recommend Major Revision The manuscript has to be re-written. The introduction must be further divided into meaningful, relevant paragraphs Shorten the material and methodology Rewrite the Conclusion. A lot of unscientific statements were used. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	Comments of all the reviewers addressed in the revised version (Attached file: Original Manuscript_AJRCS_130469).

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>	