

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130312
Title of the Manuscript:	Combining Ability Analysis for Seed Yield per Plant and Its Component Characters in Castor (<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.)
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

	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 is an interesting study. Because of the importance of castor, it is useful for breeders and for the selection process of this crop. It was right to choose exactly these traits. The methodology is relevant.	It is useful for breeder for future breeding strategy. Helps in selection process.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	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.	No	No
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The tables do NOT include the units of measurement. It is better to give tables in the text before or after its discussion. The discussion is not clear, and it is better to rewrite it.	Yes
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The two first sources must be rewritten (not Anonymous!). Double-check the format of references.	Yes
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English need to be improved. The text has many mistakes.	
Optional/General comments	The text needs to be correctly formatted!	

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