



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31964
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATIONS ON FABA BEAN (<i>Vicia faba</i> L.) 41. HETEROSIS, INBREEDING, GCA AND SCA EFFECTS OF DIALLEL-CROSS AMONG SIX GENOTYPES
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Manuscript concerns an interesting question related with the evaluation of the potentiality of faba bean parental genotypes and their crosses, the heterotic effects and general and specific combining ability effects for some quantitative traits in Giza Research Stations, Agriculture Research Center (ARC), Egypt. Six parents of faba bean were used in this study. Abstract is clear, informative, brief and representative of the work and underlines the significance of the subject. Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. Purpose and objectives are scientifically appropriate. In "Introduction" are cited 16 authors. The methods used are accurate and correctly described. So described they allow experiment to be reproduced. Appropriate statistics was used. The experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author (-s) compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. The findings are particularly valuable having in a mind importance of the crop studied. In Discussion are used 8 authors. Tables are well represented in the manuscript according to journal guide for authors.	
Minor REVISION comments	However, some minor errors were noted: In "Introduction": "..El-Hady <i>et al.</i> (1997) (13).... " Is the same author or another relative with 13. "Hady, M. M., Gh.A. Gad El-Karim and M.A. Omar (1997)..."	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	in References? In “Materials and methods” I have no comments, but I think there is no need to write formulas commonly known methods. In “Results and discussion”: Table 6 is not mentioned in the main text. In “Conclusion”. I think it is better conclusion to be presented in more detail and concrete. Not only ceased in one sentence and not begin again with the word conclusion.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Organization into sections and subsections was well done and paper structure is clear and arranged according to journal style.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Valentin Ivanov Kosev</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department - Plant breeding and seed producti, Institute of forage crops, Pleven, Bulgaria</i>