

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122816
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on genetic variability in fenugreek (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i>L.) germplasms grown under Bundelkhand region
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	Although the studied crop is of importance from economic as well as nutritional point of view but the write up, grammatical mistakes and insufficient data does not justify the publishing of this paper in its present form. Results and discussion also lacks proper understanding and interpretation of the results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I suggest the revision of title as "Estimation of genetic variability in fenugreek genotypes under Bundelkhand region"	
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.	Abstract needs improvement as even the starting sentence of the abstract is vague. Further abstract must include only important results whereas in this manuscript all results are included in the abstract. Moreover there are some grammatical mistakes as well in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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 present work done on fenugreek genotypes for assessing its genetic variability is of importance for crop improvement. The idea of the study is sound but lacks insufficient practical support and analysis. Adding a few more analysis could make it a useful study like PCA etc.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are quite insufficient to support the study and most of them are old.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are many grammatical mistakes in the text which need to be removed as suggested.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Zahid Akram
Department, University & Country	Pakistan