

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126586
Title of the Manuscript:	GENETIC DIVERSITY STUDIES IN LOCAL GERMPLASM OF SESAME (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the genetic diversity of local sesame germplasm. Understanding such diversity is crucial for crop improvement programs, particularly for enhancing seed yield and other agronomic traits. The study's findings, especially the identification of genetically diverse clusters, offer significant potential for developing high-yielding, disease-resistant sesame varieties. The results contribute meaningfully to the scientific community by highlighting the importance of genetic variability in breeding programs.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "genetic diversity studies in local germplasm of sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.)", is appropriate and clearly reflects the focus of the study.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive and well-structured, providing a clear overview of the study. However, it could benefit from additional emphasis on the potential applications of the findings in breeding programs. Including specific data on the inter-cluster distances and the traits that contribute most to genetic diversity would make it more robust. Additionally, the role of the identified superior genotypes in future breeding programmes could be highlighted more clearly.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-organized, with appropriate subsections detailing the introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. The clarity in the flow of information makes it easy to follow the research methodology and findings.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically sound and based on robust methodologies, including the use of the D² statistic and clustering techniques for genetic diversity analysis. The conclusions drawn from the results are valid, as the study identifies significant genetic variability among the genotypes, which is critical for future breeding strategies. However, since the manuscript focuses on local germplasm, the discussion could benefit from an emphasis on what sets this study apart from previous ones. Highlighting any unique environmental, agronomic, or genetic factors specific to the local sesame germplasm would strengthen its contribution.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are mostly sufficient, but a few more recent studies on genetic diversity in sesame or related crops could strengthen the manuscript. Adding references from the last five years would provide a more updated context.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally clear, but a few grammatical adjustments could enhance readability, especially in the results and discussion sections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Good There is no competing interest issue. No ethical issues were identified in the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asit Prasad Dash
Department, University & Country	S'O'A (DU), India