

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120208
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization for Qualitative Traits in Segregating Population of Faba Bean (<i>Vicia faba</i> L.)
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article presents valuable insights into the characterization of qualitative traits in faba bean populations. The detailed methodology and comprehensive discussion make it a significant contribution to the field. Addressing the identified weaknesses and incorporating the recommendations would enhance the clarity and impact of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and descriptive, providing a good understanding of the study's focus on qualitative trait characterization in faba bean populations.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract effectively summarizes the study, highlighting the observed variability in qualitative traits among the F3 populations of faba bean. It mentions the key findings and their potential implications for plant breeding programs. However, it would benefit from a more concise presentation of results and the inclusion of specific percentages or examples to illustrate variability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Background: The introduction provides a solid foundation for the study, outlining the importance of faba bean and the need for genetic characterization. • Detailed Methodology: The materials and methods section is thorough, ensuring reproducibility of the study. • Clear Presentation of Results: The use of tables and detailed descriptions effectively conveys the variability observed in qualitative traits. • Relevance to Breeding Programs: The discussion highlights the practical implications of the findings for plant breeding and crop improvement. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lengthy Results Section: The results narrative is somewhat repetitive and could be more concise, focusing on the most significant findings. • Limited Statistical Analysis: The study could benefit from a more detailed description of the statistical methods used to analyze the data. • Abstract Conciseness: The abstract could be more concise, providing specific percentages or examples to better illustrate variability. • Data Analysis Details: More information on the data analysis process and any statistical tests used would strengthen the methodology section. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise Results Presentation: Summarize the results more concisely, focusing on key findings and their implications. • Enhanced Statistical Analysis: Include more details on the statistical methods used and any significance testing performed. • Abstract Improvements: Make the abstract more concise and include specific examples or percentages to illustrate key findings. • Clearer Data Analysis Description: Provide a more detailed description of the data analysis process in the methodology section. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes with minor corrections	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the article presents valuable insights into the characterization of qualitative traits in faba bean populations. The detailed methodology and comprehensive discussion make it a significant contribution to the field. Addressing the identified weaknesses and incorporating the recommendations would enhance the clarity and impact of the study.	

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:	Rahul Banerjee
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute, Pusa, India