

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Genetic Engineering
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGE_91983
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC DIVERSITY FOR COTTON LEAF CURL DISEASE (CLCuD) AND QUALITATIVE TRAITS AMONG ELITE COTTON CULTIVARS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajbge.com/index.php/AJBGE/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	<p>This manuscript is generally poorly written and cannot be accepted in its present state. However, consideration might be given for resubmission if all the comments can be addressed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Some major suggestions that should be addressed in order to enhance the quality of your paper are: What progress against the most recent state-of-the-art similar studies was made in this study? I strongly suggest highlighting these aspects in the introduction, discussion and conclusions sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The authors did not use the correct referencing style of the journal. The in-text referencing should be numerical style. - Review the references cited throughout the manuscript. They must be actualized. - The materials and methods should be revised following suggestions in the annotated manuscript. - Your work lacks a good conclusion. Please recast this aspect. The conclusions section should not be a summary of your study or an extension of the discussion. This section should illustrate the mechanistic links of findings obtained in your genetic parameter estimate study. The conclusions should answer the hypothesis of your study and should focus on the implication of your findings. Avoid using abbreviations and acronyms in this section. Remember that the conclusions must be self-explanatory. - References are not entirely correct. Please check a sample paper and the Author's Submission guideline of the journal. - Quality of tables should be improved. - In general, some legends of tables are not all self-explainable. For instance, in Table 1, what are the meanings of PIC, SSR, etc. Remember that the table must be self-explanatory. That is, all statistics and abbreviations used must be clearly explained. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prince Emmanuel Norman
Department, University & Country	Sierra Leone Agricultural Research Institute, Sierra Leone