

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130417
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance studies in chickpea (Cicer arientinum 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 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.	Such studies are critical for identifying traits with high breeding potential, particularly in addressing challenges related to productivity and adaptability under diverse agroecological conditions. The findings provide valuable insights for breeders aiming to enhance chickpea yields and develop varieties with improved agronomic traits. It also contributes to the existing literature on chickpea improvement strategies, emphasizing sustainable agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance studies in chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.)," is descriptive and suitable for the manuscript.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, summarising key objectives, methodologies and findings effectively. However, it can be improved by including the specific statistical tools used and their implications in breeding strategies. Suggestions for Improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Add specific details about the genetic parameters (e.g., GCV, PCV) that were significant.Include the role of environmental influence on traits explicitly.Highlight the key genotypes or traits identified for potential use in breeding programs.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, but there are areas needing clarification: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The statistical methods for variability estimation (e.g., ANOVA assumptions) are referenced but not described in detail.Some values in tables need cross-verification for consistency.Ensure that all observed trends and conclusions are supported by the presented data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and cover foundational and recent studies. However, adding more recent articles post-2020 could strengthen the relevance of the manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is clear and scholarly but could benefit from minor grammatical corrections and improved sentence structuring for better readability.	
Optional/General comments	While the manuscript is valuable, it requires revisions to improve clarity, accuracy and adherence to scientific rigour. Enhanced statistical detail, updated references and grammatical refinements will significantly elevate its quality.	

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:	Asit Prasad Dash
Department, University & Country	India