SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_37686**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Agro-morphological diversity of six peanut (Arachis hypogaea L.) breeding lines from three geographical areas**
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	-	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	**1.** In this work, agro-morphological diversity of six peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) breeding lines from three geographical areas had been studied. **2.** The title is brief and properly describes the contents. **3.** The abstract is a sufficiently informative summary of the main aspects. **4.** The key words will allow proper retrieval of the information in data-bases and internet. **5.** The introduction of manuscript gives adequate information, especially about peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). **6.** The material and methods section is correct and the study can be founded on the basis of the information it contains. **7.** The quality and organization of figures are satisfactory. **8.** Quantitative data were appropriately tested with statistical methods. **9.** The results are reasonable. **10.** The discussion is correct and circumscribed to the information presented. **11.** The conclusions are warranted considering methods and results. **12.** All the references are updated and pertinent, and cited in the text. **13.** The organization and grammar are satisfactory. **14.** So, I think of that the manuscript has a scientific value. Consequently, in my opinion, the manuscript provides original data and **is suitable** for publication.	Thank You