

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125746
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of character association in pole type French bean (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) genotypes
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	French bean is an important vegetable crop mainly used for tender pods. Genotypic studies is the pivotal work for screening of superior ones for further breeding and development of high yielding varieties. This proves the utility of this study. But genotype name or accession number has not been mentioned in the manuscript. That need to be done for acceptance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	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.	Found appropriate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Appropriate methodology was applied with statistical analysis. For genotype selection corelation studies are of immense importance that were properly utilized. Character association has clearly established. But genotype name or accession number has not been mentioned in the manuscript. That need to be done for acceptance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Genotype name or accession number has not been mentioned in the manuscript. That need to be done for acceptance.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kamal Kumar Pande
Department, University & Country	India