

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_124638
Title of the Manuscript:	SELECTION STRATEGY FOR YIELD IMPROVEMENT OF CHICKPEA GENOTYPES (Cicer arietinum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>Yield improvement is very important in chickpeas especially in this modern era as food demands are rising. So selecting better varieties based on their quantitative traits are very much required to be studied for future breeding programmes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is appropriate</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>Kindly mention why this research is important. Make sure that is included initially and why all these genetic variability parameters are analysed for future breeding programs. Please reorder the abstract again. First mention the importance, where and why this study is done then move onto the results of analysis in short and then conclude which genotypes are better based on the results.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript is accurate</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>As the manuscript deals with various genetic parameters in chickpea, this can be helpful in selecting these varieties in the future especially based on the seed yield. Since, Analysis of variance indicated high significant differences among the genotypes for all the traits and that considerable variability existed in the genotypes for all the characters studied. This can benefit for improvement programmes.</p>	S
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are recent and sufficient but more recent ones can be added. Kindly check the font of the references and follow the same style for all as demanded by the journal.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is appropriate but minor corrections are still required. Always write the first letter of names in capital. Please be careful with the grammar and punctuation used. Add full stops and commas wherever required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the introduction, specify more about the chickpea crop, why the study is important in improving the yield and how it can benefit in the future. Write more about chickpeas than pulses in general. Only one para is sufficient. Rest elaborate regarding the work. Make the introduction better.</p> <p>In Materials and Methods, mention about the agronomic practices followed while growing the crop. Please mention the correct number of quantitative traits considered 12 or 13? Since both are mentioned. Correct everywhere. Write precisely about the analysis done. If possible reorder materials and methods too. Mention the genotypes before then analysis.</p> <p>Even if results are mentioned, the discussion part is completely missing. Please mention what do we understand from these results. What does this indicate and how can we select based on these genetic parameters? Write discussion for each and every analysis done under the heading results and discussion. Explain how these led to to the selection of best ones.</p> <p>Conclusion should be precise based on what these results point to and how it helps in the future.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anu George
Department, University & Country	G B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, India