

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125703
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic Variability and Character Association Studies in Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) Genotypes for Yield and Yield Attributing Traits</b>
Type of the Article	

## 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)
<p><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></p>	<p>It is interesting in the articles to comment on the negative parts obtained from the research (they always exist but are not usually included)...It is interesting to continue the research. It is also interesting to carry out new research on organic fertilizers, digestate for example, and see the results. Today there are not many articles related to the improvement of these fertilizers in agricultural production.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>The summary is correct, although it is recommended to give the content more length. It may contain the answer to questions such as: why was the study carried out? What was done and how? What are the results? What do these findings mean and what impact do they have? The summary can be structured with the sections: objective, design, setting, themes, results and conclusions or unstructured, in which the information is usually given in two or three paragraphs. The first version was chosen, correctly.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure is correct. The titles are correct. Introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.</p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>It can be considered a well-formed and structured manuscript, although some errors need to be corrected. The titles of the tables or figures must be unified, in all of them the title is written after the table or at the beginning, but in all of them the same. It is recommended to publish some images that further clarify the study carried out. Well-chosen images give the article more coherence and consistency.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>It is recommended that references are no more than 8-10 years old. Except one or two if its use is extremely important. It is suggested to carry out a bibliographic review of the studies published in the last 10 years and update the references in the text. Some more references could be recommended. Some more references could be added, up to 40. Unify font and size. The first reference is in times new roman size 12 and the rest in arial 10. Justify the text of the references. If you choose to list them, only the reference number is included in the text of the article, not the author. And if you choose to write the name of the author, in the references section the author or authors are written, but they are not numbered.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>ok</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations...</li> <li>- It would be interesting to give some more data in the conclusion, more information about the result obtained. Explain a little more the good results obtained.</li> <li>- As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study.</li> </ul>	

**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>Noe Anes Garcia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Oviedo, Spain</b>