

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116152
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic diversity analysis in medium duration pigeonpea [ <i>Cajanus cajan</i> (L) Millsp.] germplasm for different agronomic traits and biotic factors
Type of the Article	

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Yes, because it is about analysing the diversity of traits related to insects and productivity.</p> <p>I don't understand the term "medium duration pigeonpea germplasm" (See the comment in Article)</p> <p>No. should write the result of the diversity of biotic factors or the correlation between yield and biotic resistance capacity, because this is the main point of this study (See the comment in Article)</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Need to major revision in all sections, especially the result and discussion sections. (See the comment in Article)</p> <p>Sufficient and recent, but you should explain the results in more detail in the individual references and discuss them more with the previous test results instead of just writing about whether they are "the same" or "not". (See the comment in Article)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Pantipa Na Chiangmai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Silpakorn University, Thailand</b>