

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123466
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantitative Assessment of Combining Ability and Gene Action in F1 generation of Pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan (L). Miilsp.)
Type of the Article	Original research article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	This manuscript is the original research work. This article help in improvement of pigeonpea genotypes through crossing progamme. Before starting crossing programme it must be essential to know combiner and combining ability of the parents by using different mating design. Author was adopted line x tester design to know the best combiner which may be used in crossing programme for development of new hybrid variety of pigeonpea. So, this manuscript is very useful for research community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but need addition of qualitative trait also because in material and method estimation of protein content is mentioned. So, it should be Assessment of quantative and qualitative traits for combining ability and gene action in F1 gereration of pigeonpea	
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, But need to arrange according to journal requirement. Tt may add some more recent. reference	
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.	This manuscript is the original research work and scientifically robust and technically sound. This article help in improvement of pigeonpea genotypes through crossing progamme. Before starting crossing programme it must be essential to know combiner and combining ability of the parents by using different mating design. Author was adopted line x tester design to know the best combiner which may be used in crossing programme for development of new hybrid variety of pigeonpea. So, this manuscript is very useful for research community	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, But need to arrange according to journal requirement. Tt may add some more recent. reference	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Very good	
Optional/General comments	Tt is original and very important for researchers. Contents are scientifically robust and language is also excellent.	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ranju Kumari
Department, University & Country	Nalanda College of Horticulture, India