

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126148
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability Studies in Dolichos Bean (Lablab purpureus L.) for Yield and Yield Traits
Type of the Article	Original 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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 author managed to identify the gap (need to investigate genetic variability of different genotypes of Dolichos bean for selection purposes, and the need for research about this plant and information added on the significance/ or value of this plant. That was very great.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, however, suggestions were made on the document.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically sound however look at suggestions make on the document.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Not sufficient, there author need to do a wide reading on the subject matter and provide substantial citation to back up their facts.	References were added.
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, unless where suggestion were made for grammar.	
Optional/General comments	Data analysis is not clearly stated on the document, results interpretation require revision and also discuss not substantial. More comments or suggestion are made on the document.	Suggestions were considered and corrections were made.

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>	