

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124678
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIETAL CHARACTERIZATION AND SELECTION OF BEST PARENTS FOR HYBRIDIZATION PROGRAMME IN GREENGRAM ( <i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek )
Type of the Article	

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> ( <i>Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here</i> )
<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 study's findings on heritability and genetic advance can help guide future breeding programs aimed at selecting superior genotypes. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on both genotypic and environmental factors, although I would have liked to see more detailed discussions on the implications of the findings for broader agricultural practices. Overall, it makes a valuable contribution to crop improvement research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Correction</b>	
<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>	<b>The abstract of the article appears comprehensive, as it covers the key aspects of the study, including its objectives, methodology, and findings. However, to enhance clarity and completeness, I have suggested rephrasing.</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>The inclusion of a more detailed discussion section, addressing the broader implications of the findings, could enhance the clarity and impact of the study.</b>	
<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>	<b>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it uses established statistical methods, such as ANOVA, to assess genetic variation and the heritability of traits. The focus on both phenotypic and genotypic coefficients of variation, along with the identification of traits with high heritability and genetic advance, demonstrates a rigorous approach to understanding trait selection in green gram. Additionally, the results align with standard genetic principles, making the study scientifically credible.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, providing a solid foundation for the study's context and findings.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Needs revision, has been incorporated in main manuscript	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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>Priyanka Choudhary</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Banaras Hindu University, India</b>