

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122205
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of different hydrogel levels on Protein content of Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.)
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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 article as written is of no importance to the scientific community (see comments on other items in the form)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not correct as it also includes irrigation in the treatments	
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.	No. There are some mistakes, see general comments	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Did not include the objectives of the work either in the introduction or as a separate item In the literature review, nothing was mentioned about the use of hydrogel In material and methods, he did not mention the variety used or the way in which the hydrogel was used.	
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.	There are several mistakes as pointed in form	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In the literature review, nothing was mentioned about the use of hydrogel	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some English errors (irrigatin instead of irrigation). In the abstract and material and methods, he cites that he analysed bulbs (????) instead of seeds	
Optional/General comments	<p>In results and discussion a T14 appears??? and there are % of proteins that do not appear in the table (0.673, 0.860....)</p> <p>In the text it says that it analysed bulbs (??) and leaves but the table shows a % of protein without knowing whether it comes from the bulbs (???) or the leaves</p> <p>In the summary and conclusion, he writes that T10 was where the highest % of protein was observed, 1.01, but according to Table 1, the value of this treatment is different.</p> <p>Several of the reviews cited in the text were not cited. In several places it did not italicize the scientific name of the crop.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Augusto Tulmann Neto
Department, University & Country	Sao Paulo State University, Brazil