SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_50169
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Diversity for Yield and its Component Traits in Mungbean [Vigna radiata (L.) Wilczek]
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The whole write up is of acceptable standard.	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		
	The whole write-up could be put in format acceptable for this Journal (CJAST).	
Minor REVISION comments		
	Could effect as follows - 1. Line 17: Could replace 'where' with 'while 2. Could delete 's' from contributes - Line 19' - and legumes – Line 28 3. Line 22: Could be – **Keywords: Vigna radiata; Genetic divergence; D² statistics; Heterosis 4. Line 27: grown as 'an' inter-crop 5. Line 83- 84: The Mean critical difference (CD), coefficient of variation (CV) of all 6. Line 87: Table 1. Mean, standard error (SE), critical difference (CD) **and coefficient of variation (CV) of 7. Line 95: (Fig.1); Line 108: the Table 2, it was; Line 121: experiment are given 8. Lines 128 to 129: clusters could be beneficial in Line 133: Table 4. 9. In Table 4: Contribution towards genetic divergence (GD) (%) 10. Line 182: mungbean 'are' presented 11. In Lines 213; 216; 220; 223; 226; 230; 237; 241 etc botanic names could be italicized 12. Line 238: Pulses in India:	
Optional/General comments	This write- up is simple and good, could still be upgraded eg. could put few sub-headings under the Results and Discussion and, well corrected, and put in the acceptable format.	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)

SCIENCEDOMAIN international www.sciencedomain.org



SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Grace O. Tona	
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria	

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.6 (10-04-2018)