

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_120582</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of Association for yield and yield related traits in an RIL population of Green gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilezek)</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	In general, the article provides some results that can contribute to the genetic improvement of this <i>Vigna radiata</i> crop, but it does not solidly contextualize the relevance of the problem and the justification of the study. It does not provide hard data (quantities) on production and shortages of this crop as a food product. It is only limited to indicating countries where this crop species is important.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be adjusted to the following sentence suggested in the following column: Association for yield and yield related traits in an RIL population of Green gram ( <i>Vigna radiata</i> (L.) Wilezek)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is necessary to change its content. It is suggested that it contain the following basic information: Importance of the study with hard data, objective of this study, methodology used and the main conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In general, the structure of the article is in accordance with the authors' guide, but the content of some parts is not enough: the objective is missing at the end of the introduction, a better description of the methodology used is necessary. Why only two replicates? It is a very low number of replicates and the statistical analysis requires at least three replicates for the degrees of freedom (n-1) in order to carried out the statistical analysis. The discussion does not suggest what happened in some response effects supported by references related to the study, it only makes relationships of similar effects found by other author. The conclusion is very general, indicating aspects that could correspond to the discussion. Perhaps the last 4 lines are the basic conclusion, as is suggested in the following column.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is necessary to strengthen the Manuscript for greater scientific/technical rigor: The context to support the study is weak, but the most serious issue is the two replicates used when in this type of studies, it is recommended to do at least 5 replicates. The number of treatments in random blocks with 128 RILs used is not identified, and the statistical analysis limited only to analysis correlation an path analysis among the twelve variables, is very basic, it only allows us to know the proportional and inversely proportional relationships between them, but not their causality effects, mainly genetic effects.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	The references to support the introductory part to contextualize the importance of the study are few and too old (1926, 1991, 2004, etc); the references must be from the last five years.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	The comments are made in the previous sections.	
<b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the English language is suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<b>Plant height (cm), number of branches per plant, number of cluster per plant and 100 seed weight should be considered as indices for selecting high yielding green gram variety. These traits may be given more emphasis for direct selection of RILs in future Green gram breeding programmes. Hence, there is ample scope of selection for these traits.</b>	

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Aurelio Pedroza Sandoval</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Unidad Regional Universitaria de Zonas Áridas, Universidad Autónoma Chapingo, México</b>