

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123433</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Characterization of Yield, Physiological and Biochemical Responses in Chickpea Genotypes Under Contrasting Water Availability</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **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> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the drought tolerance of various chickpea genotypes, an essential trait for enhancing crop resilience under variable environmental conditions.</p> <p>By evaluating thirty genotypes under both irrigated and rainfed conditions, the study identifies genetic variation in physiological, biochemical, and morphological traits associated with drought resistance.</p> <p>This research not only advances our understanding of chickpea drought tolerance but also offers practical implications for breeding programs focused on improving crop yield and stability in the face of climate variability.</p> <p>The detailed analysis of genotype performance under different water conditions provides actionable information for breeding programs, and the identification of stable genotypes for drought tolerance is particularly useful for advancing agricultural sustainability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes it is.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is a bit comprehensive. But I would like to add that the abstract should have a brief introduction of the crop with respect to topic of interest. This will make it easy for brief overviewing of the whole paper.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is sound due to its well-structured approach, which includes the use of a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. This design is known to be a standard and reliable experimental design in agricultural research.</p> <p>The inclusion of both irrigated and rainfed conditions ensures that the genotypes are evaluated under realistic and contrasting environmental stresses, making the results broadly applicable.</p> <p>The focus on multiple evaluated parameters such as physiological, biochemical, and yield traits enhances the comprehensiveness of the study, contributing to its scientific reliability.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The following references seems so old and kind of outdated (Kashiwagi et al. 2006) (Blum and Ebercon, 1981) (Barrs and Weatherly, 1962) (Bates et al., 1973) Gonzalez and Gonzalez-Vila, (2001).</p> <p>Generally, I believe references older than 2013 should be removed if possible.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[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>Adaraloye Mujeeb</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nigeria</b>