

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_101377
Title of the Manuscript:	YIELD OF SEVERAL LOCAL UPLAND RICE LINES
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. It is interesting to note that the Tako line has shown to have high productivity in terms of tillers, number of panicles per plant, and yields compared to other lines. It's great to see that the breeding program is yielding positive results. Dongan line also seems to perform well, being the second highest-yielding line after Tako. It's worth noting that Pulu Tau Leru, Uva Buya, and Kalendeng also showed promising yields. Overall, it seems like these lines have a good potential for commercial cultivation. 2. The title is appropriate. 3. The abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes 5. Yes 6. The references are sufficient and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Corrections to several minor grammatical mistakes need to be completed.	
Optional/General comments	Relevant and important research.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raghunath Chandranauth
Department, University & Country	National Agricultural Research and Extension Institute, Guyana