

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127514
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability Studies in Early Segregating Generation of Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp subsp <i>unguiculata</i>)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	The result of this study summarizes the diversity and performances of cowpea segregating population which is an interest in cowpea breeders. The manuscript well presented the different genetic parameters i.e. heritability, PCV, GCV, etc. also, I suggest the authors to present correlation analysis results. My concern is the study was conducted only for one season (Kharif 2023) and this would reduce the reliability of the results specially for quantitatively inherited traits such as yield.	
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, the abstract is well written.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Methodology Present data analysis subsection in the methodology part and describe how you performed the analysis and which software used to carry out the analysis.</p> <p>Results and discussion Describe the table and discuss it I suggest the authors to describe which genotypes or materials had higher GCV, PCV, higher yield, etc. The tables should be described and discussed. I suggest the authors to discuss the significance of the promising genotypes among the segregating populations and relate with previous results. I suggest the authors to present the correlation results. Correlation is important in breeding as it tells which traits could be selected simultaneously. I suggest the authors to present foot notes for the table to make easy for readers to understand</p>	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically	The manuscript presented the genetic variability of F4 segregating cowpea population. The manuscript is scientifically robust, but I suggest the authors to address the suggestions and comments given above. Additionally, the study was conducted only in a single environment which	

Review Form 3

robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	reduces the reliability of the results for quantitatively inherited traits.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The authors presented sufficient references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Dejene Kebede Astatke
Department, University & Country	Makerere University, Uganda