

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121683
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Diversity for Yield Component Traits and Grain Yield of Blackgram [Vigna Mungo (L.) Hepper]
Type of the 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)
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.	I like this manuscript because it gave a detailed analysis of the Genetic Diversity of Urd bean. I like this manuscript because it was able to identify the best genotypes for grain yield. This manuscript is important because the scientific community needs to know about the high nutritional content of Urd Bean.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 results were statistically analysed using ANOVA. Urd bean genotypes that recorded highest index score would be good for future hybridization. This manuscript is scientifically correct because it solved a major problem, Urd bean contains five classes of food out of six (protein, carbs, fat, minerals and water), solving the problem of balanced diet.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but 1958, 1957, 1918 and 1955 aren't recent	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The following four references should be reviewed/changed as they are old (1958, 1957, 1918, 1955)	

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuela Etu
Department, University & Country	University of Abuja, Nigeria