

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_97520
Title of the Manuscript:	MAINTAINING AND IMPROVING PEAS (Pisum sativum L.) CV. MASTER PEA (LOCAL CULTIVAR) USING UPOV DESCRIPTOR AND MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS IN THE VEGETABLE SEED PRODUCTION FIELD
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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. 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, it is important for scientific community. Studying of variant analysis can be helpful in crop improvement programme of Pea and important QTL can be identified and incorporated in breeding programme</p> <p>Yes, to my knowledge the topic is suitable with the provide article</p> <p>Please do incorporate the statistical design followed during the experimental programme</p> <p>Good</p> <p>Fair</p> <p>Few more updated references can be add if possible.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Simple and easy to understand. Overall Good	
Optional/General comments		
	Overall the performance of the manuscript is good at least minor revision should do it and make the necessary changes as I mention in the reviewer's 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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chongtham Allaylay Devi
Department, University & Country	Sharda University, India