

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99002
Title of the Manuscript:	“Physico-Biochemical Evaluation of Certain Promising Varieties of Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.)”
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 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)	I believe this study is important for those working in the nutrition sector, as it provides a general understanding of how processing affects nutritional value as one aspect of the nutrition sector. Yes Yes Yes Yes, It would be good if they worked on other nutrients such as carbohydrates since what he wrote had low carbohydrate content, so it requires to be verified! It will be scientific support if they have updated references from 2020 and above.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Generally good, but it would be better if it is reviewed by a language expert.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Faruq Wahab
Department, University & Country	University of Sulaimani, Iraq