

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97923
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Variability and different Character Association in Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under late sown condition.
Type of the 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	-The manuscript is important for chick pea farmers, For it has broaden the choice of the Chickpea varieties to the growers - Yes the title is suitable for this study -The abstract of the article is compressive indicate the r correlation figures -The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate -The manuscript is scientifically correct, the experiment was designed and data correctly analysed -References are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- Language quality of the article is suitable for scholar communication	
Optional/General comments	The article is well done. There is a need to describe the experimental site	

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:	George Omoto
Department, University & Country	KALRO, Kenya