

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_88365
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Variability and Character Association Studies on Blackgram (Vigna mungo (L.) Hepper) for Seed Yield, Maturity and Resistance to Yellow Mosaic Virus
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The research develops an interesting topic regarding the evaluation of native germplasm, identifying characters that can be used later in a selection index and selecting some genotypes that may be tolerant to the presence of phytosanitary problems. However, it is necessary to adjust several items in the manuscript so that it is more understandable and truly reflects the potential and impact of the results found in the research. It is suggested to review the title to make it shorter and adjusted to the nature of the work. In the abstract, present the problem, the justification, the objectives, the work methodology and the impact of the results found in the research. The suggested keywords are not the most appropriate, look for them in international thesauri since these are the ones that allow greater visibility of the research. In the introduction, it is necessary to delve deeper into the main aspects addressed by the study, as well as complement it with background studies in the international, national and regional context.</p> <p>The materials and methods section should be better organized in such a way that it allows the reader or any researcher to repeat the test. It is recommended to work on it by subtitles and to emphasize fundamental aspects such as the description of the germplasm (Include a table with the places of origin and some biological or genetic characteristics, if available, of the accessions), the experimental design, the variables in the latter, fully describe them, how they were measured and the frequency of measurement, from where they were taken. Specify very well the treatments, the experimental units and the repetitions as well as the agronomic management given in the field. Include the georeferencing of the site where the trial was established as well as its main agroclimatological conditions. Finally, the methodology does not include how the incidence and severity of the virus was evaluated, an aspect that is important in the study. The results and discussion section is very poor, since the very descriptive results are presented and the arguments presented are supported by few studies, outdated and of which a complementary analysis is not made, they are only mentioned. It is necessary to look at this part carefully and look for new bibliographic sources that allow them to broaden the horizon of the discussion from a biological, agronomic or genetic approach, so that the real potential of the research can be evidenced. The discussion is focused a lot on the variables but it does not include which are the genotypes that present these good or bad characteristics. The conclusion must show the impact of the research and not be a summary with the main results obtained in the work. Most of the references are very outdated if there are no more up-to-date studies on this species, use the newest ones and complement the manuscript with studies on related species or related genera, to give greater relevance to the work.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Check the English throughout the manuscript, also do not leave very long paragraphs, complement the legends of tables and figures are very general. The meaning of the abbreviations used should be explained.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The researchers carry out important work at the international, national and regional levels, however the way in which the manuscript is presented is not the most appropriate. A thorough review by all authors of the manuscript is necessary for the reader to understand the potential of the research. It is necessary to consult new bibliographic sources to enrich items such as the introduction and discussion of the manuscript. Focus on conducting a more practical than descriptive analysis of the results and use comparative studies to highlight the importance of the evaluated germplasm. Improving the materials and methods section for the study can be reproducible, as well as selecting the keywords very well to be able to make the research more visible on the web. In the conclusions highlight the biological, agronomic and genetic potential of the research findings. The authors are suggested to review other observations that were indicated within the manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ana Cruz Morillo Coronado
Department, University & Country	Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de, Colombia