

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126601
Title of the Manuscript:	Recombinant Breeding in Barnyard Millet (Echinochloa frumentacea. L): Pioneering High-Yield Varieties for Sustainable Agriculture
Type of the 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The significance of minor crops in this constantly changing environment is highlighted in this manuscript. Farmers can now reduce their dependency on pesticides to protect crops from pests and disease as a result of the new resistant type discussed in this writing. Overall, I think this manuscript is good.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable title.	
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.	Abstract is good.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Table format could be improved.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The results I found here may be less erroneous because it is a multi-year trial. Local and national checks were used in the trials as a reference to boost the suggested variety's dependability. These facts led me to believe that this manuscript is technically good and has strong scientific support.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The statements provided would have been more credible if there had been fewer references included.	
Minor REVISION comments	Suitable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Reference styling needs to be checked. Figures that are mentioned is not provided. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suman Ghimire
Department, University & Country	Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal