

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104835
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance of Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) Genotypes under Organic 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>General Comments</p> <p>From my point of view, it is a very interesting topic and simultaneously it seems that to the best of my knowledge is an important research based on an experiment was conducted using twenty-two genotypes of chickpea in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications along with plot size of 1.20 x 1 m and the plant geometry was maintained at 10cm X 30cm during Rabi 2019-20. The material was shown on 23rd October, 2019. Observations were recorded on the basis of five random competitive plants selected from each genotype separately for yield and its attributing parameters were evaluated as per standard procedure.</p> <p>The Results show that: The genotypes were highly significant for all characters expect day to 50% germination, number of primary branches per plant, root fresh weight and root dry weight. High phenotypic coefficient of variance (PCV) and genotypic coefficient of variance (GCV) were observed for number of nodules per plant, number of pods per plant and number of seeds per pod. High heritability coupled with high genetic advance as percentage of mean for number of nodules per plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, test weight, seed yield per plant and biological yield per plant.</p> <p>In Conclusion: Highly significant genetic variability present in the existing material which can be used in breeding programme for crop improvement. High heritability coupled with high genetic advance for number of nodules per plant, number of pods per plant, number of seeds per pod, test weight, seed yield per plant and biological yield per plant, hence, that these traits can be improved through direct selection.</p> <p>The paper consists of the sections: Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion.</p> <p>However, I find some recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract must contains the main purpose of the paper, the research method used in the research and the main contributions. It would be very useful to add in the "Introduction" section the purpose, objectives and hypothesis of the research. The Literature Review section cannot be missing from the paper. I consider an econometric model will increase the quality of the paper. In the same time, I consider the literature review section cannot missing from the paper and that is why we consider that the literature is not enough and that is why, we recommend the authors to refer to other recent works indexed in Web of Science, Scopus, Emerald, Cambrige, and of course MDPI Journals. We suggest that the authors cite papers published in MDPI journals and Web of Science Journals, such as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Batrancea L., Batrancea I., Moscviciov A. (2009), The Roots of the World Financial Crisis, Annals of Faculty of Economics, 3(1):57-62. Moscviciov, A., Bătrâncea, I., Bătrâncea, M., Bătrâncea, L.M. (2010) Financial Ratio Analysis Used In the It Enterprises, Annals of the University of Oradea: Economic Science, 19(2):600-603. We also consider that an important cause that influences GDP is fiscal compliance and therefore even if this variable was not taken into account, the authors should refer to the works published on this topic, namely: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Batrancea L.M., Nichita R.A., Batrancea I. (2012), Tax Non-Compliance Behavior in the 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Light of Tax Law Complexity and the Relationship between Authorities and Taxpayers, <i>Annals of the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University-Economics</i>, 59(1), pp.97–106.</p> <p>2. Nichita R.A., Batrancea L.M., (2012), The Implications of Tax Morale on Tax Compliance Behavior, <i>Annals of University of Oradea: Economic Science</i>, 21(1)1, 739–744.</p> <p>7. Another important cause that must be mentioned in the paper is the link between GDP, fiscal compliance and shadow economy, as the independent variables fiscal compliance and shadow economy strongly influence GDP. In this sense, I recommend the authors to quote the paper:</p> <p>3. Batrancea L., Nichita A., Batrancea I., Gaban L. (2018). „The Strenght of the Relationship Between Shadow Economy and Corruption: Evidence from a Worldwide Country-Sample”. <i>Social Indicators Research</i> 138(3), 1119-1143; DOI: 10.1007/s11205-017-1696-z</p> <p>We recommend the authors to number the paragraphs: 1. Introduction; 2.Literature review; 3. Methods and Results, Discussions and Conclusions. In conclusion, the article should be thoroughly rebuilt (changes in structure recommended above). It should also be enhanced with a review of the literature adequate to the subject and a broader interpretation and commentary of the research results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The Manuscript needs careful English proofreading because there are some shortcomings. For instance, the article “the” is sometimes missing in front of nouns, the message in some paragraphs is not clear enough.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer’s comment</p>	<p>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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Batrancea Larissa Margareta</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Babes-Bolyai University, Romania</p>