

**Review Form 3**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>                                  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJPSS_130650  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Inheritance of Northern Corn Leaf Blight Resistance in Advanced Generations of Maize (Zea mays L.) |
| Type of the Article      |  |

**General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected Original Research Articleonly 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. | Yes, the quality of the manuscript is good and important for the scientific community.     | We conducted this study because the NCLB disease has economic importance in the NEH region, so it is necessary to address the problem from the plant breeder's perspective.   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)   | Yes, the title is well composed having relevance, clarity, and effectiveness               | The title was kept concise to capture the main focus 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, it pinpoints the key elements like its objectives and conclusions                     | We appreciate the reviewer's effort in thoroughly reviewing our manuscript.   |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.  | Yes, it was well structured  | We utilized wide range of statistical tools available from published literature and text books to conduct thorough analysis.  |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.                              | Yes, references are sufficient   | We have incorporated references from both recent studies as well as foundational research to provide a complete perspective on the topic.   |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | Yes  | We aimed to make the manuscript as clear and comprehensible as possible.  |
| Optional/General comments  | 1. Minor mistakes were noted in the manuscript please correct<br><br>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT | We sincerely appreciate the insightful comments and suggestions given by the reviewer which will be helpful in improving the quality of the manuscript and we have made the necessary corrections, as suggested by the reviewer. The F <sub>5</sub> families have been confirmed. |

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> | No ethical issues.   |