

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_123635</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic Variability and Genetic Diversity Study in Indian Mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i> L.) Under Timely and Late Sown Conditions</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	<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>	It is a very important research work for uplifting quantitative increase in oilseed production. More research should be focused on qualitative characters like oil quality etc. Erucic acid content and other fatty acids profiling are the some major research areas for current scenario.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	
<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>	Explained well with a comprehensive manner	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<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>	Some minor mistakes have been noticed in the reference sections. In some references, the years are mismatched with the years that are being written in the article. Eg. Pause and Sukhatme. The author is advised to revise once and correct the reference section.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Sufficient and recent. Suggested to explain the contributions of Gupta <i>et al.</i> , 2018, Gupta <i>et al.</i> ,2022, Mahalanobis <i>et al.</i> , 1935 in the manuscript	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes. Suggested to minor revision	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Well explained article. Best wishes	

#### 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>Rajesh Chintey</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Birangana Sati Sadhani Rajyik Vishwavidyalaya, India</b>