

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_99808
Title of the Manuscript:	AMMI and GGE Biplot Analysis of Yield and related traits among Selected mini-core Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan L. Millsp.) Accessions
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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The manuscript is important for scientific community. - The reviewer's recommendation is to avoid abbreviations in the title " AMMI and GGE Biplot Analysis of Yield and related traits among Selected mini-core Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan L. Millsp.) Accessions ". The recommendation of the title - "Research of yield and related traits among a selected mini-core Pigeonpea – Biplot Analysis (Cajanus cajan L. Millsp.) Accessions” - The abstract of the article is comprehensive, although the reviewer recommends that the final results of the research be highlighted in the discussion section or in the conclusion. The sentences “The environment had the least influence on variation. ISC 169, ISC-3, ISC197, ISC-76, and ISC 134 pigeonpea genotypes were highly stable and high yielding across all environments, and Kogi was revealed to be the closest to the ideal environment for pigeonpea production, while Edo is a highly suitable location for specific adaptation of pigeonpea genotypes” – should be moved in the conclusion section. Since these data are indicated in the conclusion, they should not be listed in the abstract of the article. - The article is scientifically correct - The references sufficient and recent. Recommended reference: Sheahan, C.M. 2012. Plant guide for pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan). USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cape May Plant Materials Center. Cape May, NJ. 08210. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Recommended reference: Sheahan, C.M. 2012. Plant guide for pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan). USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service, Cape May Plant Materials Center. Cape May, NJ. 08210.</p> <p>The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Biljana Stojan Ilic
Department, University & Country	Project Management College, Educons University, Serbia