

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_127044
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF GENETIC DIVERSITY IN GREEN GRAM [<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilczek] FOR QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE TRAITS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>Mungbean is an excellent rotation crop in a rice-based cropping system because of its low input requirements, short crop duration, and strong worldwide demand. Mungbean is regarded as the hardiest pulse crop and is a significant pulse crop. Known most popularly as "poor mans meat," mungbean is the main source of protein for a substantial portion of the global vegetarian population.</p> <p>The study of diversity within a species is genetic diversity.</p> <p>More diversity increases the likelihood of choosing suitable genotypes for hybridization. The ability to estimate parental diversity may be aided by direct chemical examination of genetic material or gene products.</p> <p>The present study was conducted as it provides a quantitative assessment of the link between geographic and genetic diversity based on generalized distance and is useful for assessing the degree of genetic divergence.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is</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>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The objective of the study is best described at the end of the Introduction.</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 genetic diversity among landraces is determined by the range of D^2 values which varied from 44.68 (MG-2022-15 and MG-2022-30) to 1678.53 (MG-2022-18 and MG-2022-31) for each genotype, showing adequate variance.</p> <p>Based on D^2 levels, the 42 genotypes were split up into 16 groups with notable genetic differences. Cluster I and III were the largest, with 11 and 10 genotypes each. It was adjacent to Clusters II, which had eight genotypes.</p> <p>Based on inter-cluster means and per se performance, breeding programs may employ the following effective genotypes viz., MG-2022-31, MG-2022-42, MG-2022-21, MG-2022-40, MG-2022-39, MG-2022-14, MG-2022-11, MG-2022-18, MG-2022-02, MG-2022-25, and MG-2022-24 to further enhance grain yield and its contributing characters in mungbean.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references are sufficient. Internationally recognized abbreviations should be used to write the title of the journals.</p> <p>In these two references:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Anonymous, (2019-2020). India Agristat, an associate website of www.indistat.com. -Anonymous, (2020). Area, production, and productivity of major pulses in India. www.agropedia.iitk.ac.in. 	

Review Form 3

	Date consulted should be reflected	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Jesus G. Rodríguez Diego
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, México