

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125371
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating chickpea ( <i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) varieties for their resistance to gram pod borer ( <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> , Hubner) in a protected environment.
Type of the Article	Evaluating chickpea ( <i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) varieties for their resistance to gram pod borer ( <i>Helicoverpaarmigera</i> , Hubner) in a protected environment

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	Chickpea is an important pulse crop and Gram pod borer is a very important pest of chickpea crop. Since gram pod borer is a polyphagous pest and it causes significant damage to the crop, managing of this pest is utmost important. Managing pod borer menace through host plant resistance will reduce use of insecticides. However, number of genotypes should have been more instead of only 8.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Minor modification may be done as "Evaluation of chickpea ( <i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) genotypes for their resistance against gram pod borer ( <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> , Hubner) in a protected environment"	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	It is good. If possible it may be refined.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, appropriate	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	There is a very much necessity to identify promising resistant genotypes against gram pod borer. This work found out few suitable resistant genotypes which can be exploited for cultivation and higher production. The work was carried out following certain criteria in assessing the resistance in genotypes. Results were illustrated with figures and tables.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	References were not of very recent. If possible recent references may be included.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Research was conducted with an objective of identification of resistant chickpea genotypes against pod borer. This work may be further continued by doing molecular and biochemical analysis for knowing the basis of resistance.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>R. Shravan Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Professor Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, India</b>