

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_91700
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic diversity of agro-morphogenic traits in soybean (<i>Glycine max L. Merr.</i>)
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.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Check the following reference, it is a book not a journal's paper. Correct it accordingly. Singh, R.K. and Chaudhury, B.D. (1985). Biometrical methods of quantitative genetic analysis. <i>Haryana J. Hort. Sci.</i> 12(2): 151-156.2. Tables headings should be self-explanatory and should be referred properly in the text.3. Weather grouping of all the genotypes by all of five methods was same? If not then results should be presented analysis wise and a comparison of method will add value to the article.4. Table 4 was not referred in text.5. I have rearranged the table and figures according to their reference in text but little more explanation of results is required in text.6. How figure 1 and 2 differ? If not different then keep only one i.e., Figure 2.7. What is the conclusion drawn from table 5.8. Non-hierarchical clustering was not mentioned in Materials & Methods but results are presented. However, Mahalanobis D square find place in M&M but the results are not presented.9. Little more explanation is required regarding calculation of cluster means and contribution of characters.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Study is good but poorly explained. Needs thorough revision.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anand Singh Jeena
Department, University & Country	G B Pant University of Ag. & Tech., India