

### 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	

#### **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 write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript deals with the variability analysis in "Fennel", a spice crop. Genetic variability analysis in such crops is not that frequent. Such reports could help in improvement of concerned crop in accelerated manner.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes. For the context discussed inside text, the title is suitable.	
<b>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.</b>	Abstract contains some redundant information such as details of experimental site, significance among blocks, etc, Such information could be avoided in abstract and information of traits recorded could be provided.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript lacks scientific correctness in most sections. For example, ANOVA for augmented design is provided without test genotypes and genotypes vs checks as sources of variation. Author, themselves, has not understood the concept of each genetic parameter clearly. For example, significance of GCV for selection and effect possessed by selection on trait value are not clearly discussed by the author.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Most of the references cited are not recent enough.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Improvement in the language quality is suggested	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	To improve the value of this paper, adding the results on correlation and path coefficient analysis for recorded traits is suggested. Other comments are provided in the manuscript file as track changes. Please have a check.	

#### **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)
<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>Parameshwaran Mathavaraj</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assam Agricultural University, India</b>