

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_122534</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic diversity analysis in Sesame (Sesamum indicum L.)</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The author(s) has made a good analysis on the genetic diversity and found to analyse 30 genotypes. Few of the following points can be considered for the betterment of the manuscripts and journal quality. 1. Why Tocher's method is chosen by the researcher for cluster distinction? 2. Why Pillai's trace criterion and Roy's ger criterion were not taken in to account by the researcher?	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	NA	
<b>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.</b>	The author(s) uses substantial diversity term but lack of the discussion or interpretation in the article. Cross combination were not included in the methodology part as this was mentioned in the discussion part. Selecting genotypes with high mean values for specific traits within their clusters can be advantageous for hybridization programs- this states the high mean value will have advantage in hybridization, but there is no such statistical report or the trait results evidence for this.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Andrew's plot, K clustering algorithm can be included in the methods for better clustering analysis.	
<b>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.</b>		
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Some more references can be included.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Author(s) are requested to check the line spacing of the entire manuscript .	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>J. Madhusudhanan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Anand Institute of Higher Technology, Anna University, India</b>