

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124439
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Dissecting</b> Genetic Variability and Character Association in F3 Generation of Chickpea ( <i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under Rainfed and Irrigated Conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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)
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 important because it helps understand genetic variability of some traits and predict the efficiency of selection. Since the F3 generation segregates, it can be organized in lines and grown at normal plant densities that integrates competition effects. Genetic components of the mean and variance can be estimated more easily under more realistic cropping conditions. However : - Some details about the parents used could be useful - Variance analysis of the characters between the two environmental conditions may help understand why these conditions were studied, and what was their compared effect - Table 3 is missing - Range of variations in the abstract is not highlighted in the manuscript - It could have been good to highlight the high value of GCV, PCV, GA and heritability in the tables	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes But one could remove the word "Dissecting"	
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.	Yes But : - A sentence is duplicated - Range of variation dealt with in the abstract is mentioned only in conclusion, not in results and discussion - Data about correlation mentioned are missing in the manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It would have better to use subtitles in results ad discussion section in order to help understand and follow the title of the manuscript	
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 manuscript is robust because it showed and analyses a lot of results concerning chickpea characters. It contributes to reveal which selection possibilities are suitable and can help improve characters in two environmental conditions. However, significance of differences of means between the two environmental conditions are highlighted so one can't understand why the two conditions were studied.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes But when citing references in the text, it would be better to mention the species and generations studied in order to make good comparison of results.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**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>Yakoro Alphonse</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso</b>