

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122430
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Variability and Character Relationships for Seed Yield in Black Gram [Vigna mungo (L.) Hepper]
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<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 variability and character relationships in black gram, which is an essential pulse crop for food security and agricultural sustainability. The findings on traits such as seed yield per plant, pod length and clusters per plant are crucial for breeding programs aimed at improving yield and adaptability. The correlation and path analysis further contribute to understanding trait interrelationships, making this research relevant to the scientific community focusing on legume breeding.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a more specific title could be: "Assessment of Variability and Character Relationships of Seed Yield and Yield Attributing Traits in Black Gram [<i>Vigna mungo</i> (L.) Hepper]"</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 but could benefit from clearer presentation of key findings and their implications. Mentioning the practical implications of the findings for breeding programs could also enhance the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow from the introduction through to the results and discussion. Each section is well-organized, contributing to a coherent narrative.</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>This manuscript is scientifically robust, with a well-designed experiment that employs appropriate statistical methods such as correlation and path analysis. The findings are well-supported by data and align with existing literature, indicating sound methodology. The use of both genotypic and phenotypic coefficients of variation, along with heritability estimates, strengthens the study's conclusions about the potential for genetic improvement in black gram. However, the author may consider including the genotypic correlation analysis in the manuscript. A residual value of 0.57 is too much for path coefficient analysis. Author should recheck the analysis for any error.</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 sufficient and include relevant and recent studies. However, some additional recent references on the topic could further enrich the discussion. The inclusion of more global studies might also broaden the manuscript's appeal.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but some sentences could be rephrased for clarity. For instance, the abstract could be streamlined to improve readability.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written and contributes valuable information to the field. Addressing the minor revision comments will enhance the clarity and impact of the study.</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