

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_87907
Title of the Manuscript:	AMMI modeling of Stability and Genotype by Environment Interaction of Common Bean Varieties (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) in Mbeya region, Tanzania
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Error in unit usage on yield parameters kg/ha (in the result and discussion page 6) or t/ha (in the abstract). 2. Please provide information related time of trial (years) and how long the research was conducted (years). 3. How many experimental plots in one location. 4. Information was relate to environmental conditions, how is the temperature, average humidity and rainfall when the research conducted. This information relates to changes in growth and yield if the research carried out at different times. 5. Consistency of writing G by E, G x E or G*E, choose one. 	
Optional/General comments	This scientific manuscript has been well written. Abstract has been written clearly, there is information about the objectives, methods and general results. The introduction contains information about the advantages of this research. The materials and methods have also been well organized and clear. In the discussion section, data has been displayed and a discussion of why there are differences and interactions between each treatment. At the end, it is concluded from this paper well and in accordance with the research objectives.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Didi Darmadi
Department, University & Country	Indonesia