

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_118982
Title of the Manuscript:	To estimate genetic variability and genetic advance for bulb yield and its components of different mutant lines of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.) under Chhattisgarh plains
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is. This manuscript investigate garlic and some genetic variations in different mutant lines. The author(s) did a great job in their investigations.</p> <p>The title can be modified thus: "Evaluation of genetic variability and genetic advance for bulb yield and its (what components – phytochemical, proximate, etc?) components of different mutant lines of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.) under Chhattisgarh plains</p> <p>The abstract does not have the result section, especially significant results were not highlighted.</p> <p>The "Result and Discussion" section is confusing because there were written in two different places, and I highlighted the confusion as well in the main work.</p> <p>Based on their analysis, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are very limited – 17 total references is not ideal for a research article. It is either enough literature review was not done, or the literatures reviewed were not cited/referenced. I highlighted some in the main work also.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English quality is suitable, but there are so many short sentences which could be made better using conjunctions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chukwudi Humphrey Omeoga
Department, University & Country	University at Albany, State University of New York, United States of America