

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129765
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation and Characterization of Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) germplasm lines as per DUS Guidelines
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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Two seasons were considered for the evaluation to support its repeatability. A standard descriptor was used for the characterization. The result of the study could be used for future reference.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title could be modified as 'Evaluation and Characterization of Groundnut (Arachis hypogaea L.) germplasm lines following DUS Guidelines'	
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.	The abstract is too scanty. It should include some of the study's major findings and a suitable conclusion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. However, no data analysis was mentioned to support the claim of the distinctness of the genotypes evaluated.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient. The authors should include more recent and relevant references	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is satisfactory except for some typographic errors	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Olabisi E. Olajire
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Genetic Resources and Biotechnology (NACGRAB), Nigeria