

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_95177
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Variability in Physiological Traits on Chickpea in three Sown Environments
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalcjust.com/index.php/CJAST/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Manuscript not written/ presented properly, it is research article not review article.</p> <p>Suitable lot of correction.</p> <p>Yes, but not informative and brief</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Scientifically not justified the work carried besides morphological variations were not shown in the form of figures</p> <p>Only 10 references were cited, which is very less besides they are very old. Discussion chapter not written and results were not justified along with appropriate references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Manuscript is indicated as review article, but it is research article, besides some of the chapters were not discussed properly / completely.</p> <p>Reference chapter and citation in the manuscript is not as per the journal guidelines.</p> <p>Chapters were not given numeric numbers as per journal guidelines, which is corrected.</p> <p>Discussion chapter is missing, which need to be added, besides acknowledgement and competing interest is missing.</p> <p>Citations were old and very few.</p> <p>Reference chapter not written as per the journal guidelines.</p> <p>Corrections were indicated in the manuscript which may be adopted / corrected</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Journal guidelines for reference citation and style is not followed, which need to be rectified</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Prashanth Sangannavar
Department, University & Country	India