

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_130469
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Agronomic Performance of Premium Quality Advanced Breeding Lines of Indica Rice</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research</b>

#### **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>	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.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	
<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>	<b>The abstract has to be drafted again with proper English. Names to the statistical methods used must be clearly mentioned in the abstract.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	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.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	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	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	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.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>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</b>	

**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>Dibyendu Seth</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ccs Haryana Agricultural University, India</b>