



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_26971
Title of the Manuscript:	GENOTYPING OF PIGEON PEA [Cajanus cajan (L.) Millsp.] ACCESSIONS OBTAINED FROM INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE (IITA) GERMPLASM USING RANDOM AMPLIFIED POLYMORPHIC DNA
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:

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



SDI 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	. The Dendrogram based on UPGMA should be replace for a better quality picture.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	That's too much citation in the introduction part. I strongly recommend to rewrite it. The introduction does not have a strict word limit, unlike the abstract, but it should be as concise as possible. It can be a tricky part of the paper to write, so many scientists and researchers prefer to write it last, ensuring that they miss no major points.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Cut off the origin of the accessions that you worked with from the title. It's supposed to be material and methods.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Karine Kettener</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Sao Paulo State, Brazil</i>