

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125837
Title of the Manuscript:	Unveiling Genetic Diversity in Grain Amaranth through K-means Clustering and Principal Component Analysis
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript provides information on the variation among the amaranth collections for some key agronomic traits that could be harnessed for breeding purposes. The study will also contribute to the conservation and utilization of the germplasm. A clear and suitable justification was provided to support the findings of the study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
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.	Some of the statements included could be taken to the introduction while the source of germplasm and a suitable conclusion will add value to the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is appropriate except for some too detailed explanations could be reduced.	
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.	The author gave background information for the methods used. A clear and detailed justification for the results was provided. A robust discussion also made the manuscript scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Over 50% of the references used are over ten years old. Also, the references used for paragraphs 1 and 2 of the introduction are insufficient. Therefore, it is suggested that the author include more relevant and recent citations in the article.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is suitable. However, the following we observed/ suggested The author did not refer to existing knowledge or previous studies in the introduction on the diversity of amaranth. Including this will make the article to be more robust. The source(s) of germplasm should be mentioned in the material and methods The author should be consistent, either they use germplasm or accessions to refer to the amaranth collections The legend in Figure 1 should be clearer and show all the distinct clusters The author should state how the findings relate to similar studies on the diversity of Amaranth	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Plagiarism was not suspected There are no competing interest issues in the manuscript. There are no ethical issues in the manuscript	

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:	Olabisi E. Olajire
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Genetic Resources and Biotechnology, Nigeria