

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JEAI_117792
Title of the Manuscript:	"Unraveling the Genetic Basis of Fusarium Wilt Resistance in Chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.): Insights into Disease Mechanisms and Breeding Strategies for Sustainable Crop Protection."
Type of the Article	Review

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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  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.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>No, the Abstract is short about 142 words without any sceptically findings. The abstract provides a good overview, but it could be enhanced by specifying the primary objectives of the study more explicitly. Mentioning the methodology and major findings succinctly would also improve its comprehensiveness.</p> <p>Yes, Overall, the manuscript has potential for publication but would benefit from addressing the drawbacks and incorporating the suggested improvements.</p> <p>Yes, Ensure consistency in citation style throughout the manuscript. Check for missing information in the references (e.g., page numbers for book chapters).</p> <p>Proofread the manuscript for grammatical errors, typos, and clarity issues. Use consistent terminology and avoid repetition where possible.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>Yes, the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Overall, the manuscript has potential for publication but would benefit from addressing the drawbacks and incorporating the suggested improvements.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Tahir Mahmood
Department, University & Country	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan