

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_93423
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic analysis for phenological characters in desi x desi crosses of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) under timely and late sown conditions
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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	The authors have done an interesting work on Genetic analysis for phenological characters in desi x desi crosses of chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) under timely and late sown conditions with interesting findings. However, they need to improve the write up in light of specific concerns raised in the annotated document. - Quality of tables should be improved. - In general, some legends of tables are not all self-explainable. For instance, in Table 4, what are the meanings of E1, E2, A, B, C, D, m, d, h, l, j, l, etc. Remember that the table must be self-explanatory. That is, all statistics and abbreviations used must be clearly explained. The conclusions section should not be a summary of your study or an extension of the discussion. This section should illustrate the mechanistic links of findings obtained in your study. The conclusions should answer the hypothesis of your study and should focus on the implication of your findings. Remember that the conclusions must be self-explanatory.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Prince Emmanuel Norman
Department, University & Country	Sierra Leone Agricultural Research Institute, Sierra Leone