

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119095
Title of the Manuscript:	IDENTIFICATION OF DROUGHT TOLERANT FENUGREEK MUTANTS AT SEEDLING STAGE THROUGH MULTI-TRAIT GENOTYPE-IDEOTYPE DISTANCE INDEX (MGIDI)
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Below are specific comments and suggestions for each section of the manuscript titled "Identification of Drought Tolerant Fenugreek Mutants at Seedling Stage through Multi-Trait Genotype-Ideotype Distance Index (MGIDI)."</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract is well-structured but lacks details on the significance of the study. 2. The results section could be more specific about the findings. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a sentence on why drought tolerance in fenugreek is crucial for agriculture. • Specify key findings and their implications more clearly. <p>Introduction</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction provides a good background but could benefit from more detail on the challenges of drought in fenugreek cultivation. 2. The research objectives are not clearly stated. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand on the impact of drought on fenugreek and its economic importance. • Clearly outline the research objectives and questions at the end of the introduction. <p>Materials and Methods</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methodology is comprehensive but lacks detail on the selection criteria for the mutants. 2. The description of the MGIDI method could be clearer. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include more information on how the fenugreek mutants were selected. • Provide a step-by-step explanation of the MGIDI method. <p>Results</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The results are presented clearly but could be more detailed. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>2. Some figures and tables lack descriptive captions.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add more detailed descriptions and analysis of the key results.• Ensure all figures and tables have clear and informative captions. <p>Discussion</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The discussion interprets the results well but could relate them more to previous studies.2. The implications of the findings are not thoroughly explored. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Compare your findings with those from similar studies to highlight their significance.• Discuss the broader implications for fenugreek breeding and agricultural practices. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The conclusion summarizes the findings but lacks specific recommendations.2. It introduces a new idea not discussed in the results. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide clear recommendations based on your findings.• Ensure no new information is introduced in the conclusion. <p>References</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The reference list is comprehensive but needs consistent formatting.2. Some in-text citations are missing from the reference list. <p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure all references are formatted according to the journal's guidelines.• Double-check that all in-text citations are included in the reference list	
--	--	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Excellent	
Optional/General comments	General Comments Comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The manuscript has a few grammatical errors and typos.2. Some sections lack clarity and coherence. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Proofread the manuscript to correct grammatical errors and typos.• Ensure each section flows logically and is easy to understand.	

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:	Muhammad Mehran Anjum
Department, University & Country	Switzerland