

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120405
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON GENETIC VARIABILITY, HERITABILITY AND GENETIC ADVANCE IN FENUGREEK (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understanding genetic variability helps plant breeders identify superior genotypes. Heritability estimates guide selection of traits for breeding programs. Genetic advance indicates the potential gain from selection. Advances our understanding of inheritance patterns and gene action. Contributes to broader scientific knowledge in genetics and plant breeding. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Studies on Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance in fenugreek (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is good abstract but not well discussed please it needs little revision discuss your findings here with existing literatures' concepts	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, good but very short I don't know it might be the guideline of the journal for me it is better to add some ideas speciality in results and discussion parts since there are many fresh readers to make it clear for another research ideas more for such researchers.	
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.	It is good manuscript from title up to the finding but it needs some improvements like adding more literatures in results and discussion parts since it is very short and correct such errors by Hanson et al., 1956	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Not even some are very old no new research done on this area world wide why you use oldest references please try to shape these problems	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but it needs scientific flows for scientific communities to make it easily understandable	
Optional/General comments	I like the paper but these comments should be included	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kasim Roba Jilo
Department, University & Country	Research Institute of Agriculture, Ethiopia