

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_124926
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Approaches for Genetic analysis of Chickpea Genotypes under Late Sown Condition</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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 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.	The manuscript is genetically sound and tends to provide a lot more to the scientific community on the importance of hybridization between different genotypes of chickpea and the desirable sergeant for various yield attributing traits essential to yield realization. Evaluating a sample size of 36 desi genotypes of chickpeas clearly demonstrate scientific reliability in relations to the findings. The impacts of climate change on plant growth and yield development are concerning and is stimulating researchers such as this author to begin devising alternative means of growing crops using irrigation system and not wholly relying on rainfed condition. I look forward to the author coming up and researching on more study gaps on "Approaches for genetic analysis of chickpea genotypes under late sown condition".	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable, but I would advise that the author include the study location. If not, the author should bring out the study location in the introduction. That way, his/her readers get to know the geographic location the study was conducted. It is very important for scientific research such as the study.	
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive and well aligned. However, the author should reduce the 292 words to 250 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	The sample size of chickpea genotypes and methods used in the study delved to the correctness of the manuscript. Besides, the types of data collected, and the organization of the data further accentuated the correctness of the manuscript as it aligned to the results and discussion. The author brilliantly concluded the study with high level of cohesiveness which I took serious interest in.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are not sufficient especially for the introduction. The author needs to provide references for some of the statements written and should endeavour to expand more on the importance of chickpeas focusing on selection, hybridization, and successive trait integration as shown in the abstract.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is of quality for scholarly communication. The author did extremely well to communicate the subject especially in the results and discussion.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should labour to provide citation (s) for the methods used in the current study. Nonetheless, the study is helpful to the scientific community and should be accepted for publication once the minor corrections highlighted are made.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>William S. Kollie</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Liberia, Liberia</b>