

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125630
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in fennel ( <i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> Mill.)
Type of the Article	Research 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	<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
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 subject of the study presented by the authors is interesting and topical, with high scientific and practical importance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is appropriate, in relation to the topic addressed.	
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.	The article Abstract is comprehensive and the keywords are representative of the article topic.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, in accordance with the General Guideline for Authors, Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology.	
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 introduction is presented appropriately, in accordance with the subject of the study. The introduction contains only one bibliographic source. It is necessary for the authors to make a more extensive documentation, and to provide more sources to support the Introduction chapter more consistently. Methodology of the study was clearly presented, and appropriate to the proposed objectives. The obtained results are important, and have been analyzed and interpreted correctly, in accordance with the current methodology. The discussions are appropriate, in the context of the obtained results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	It is necessary for the authors to make a more extensive documentation, and to provide more sources to support the Introduction chapter more consistently.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language/quality of the article is suitable for academic communications, and the article is accessible to readers.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The introduction is supported by a single bibliographic source. Additional documentation is required. It is recommended to use the appropriate symbol for coordinates e.g. "24.47°" instead of "24.470" The bibliographic sources in the "Materials and Methods" chapter are correct, but more recent sources would also be appropriate. "Table 1" instead of "Table-1" It is recommended to present the measurement units associated with the values presented in the text of the article.  The "Conclusions" chapter could be more consistent.	

### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Florin Sala</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I", Romania</b>