SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCS_46260**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Genetic variability among cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp) mini core collection**
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)

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	**Good research work on the genetic variability in cowpea mini core collection. Variability is the major indices for selection in any population. The findings highlighted in this research shows the broad genetic base of the collections studied, revealing the inherent potentials of the accessions in terms of growth and yield attributes that can further be exploited in improving low quality and narrow genetic base genotypes for food security and income generation.**	We agree
Minor REVISION comments	1. Some corrections have been made in the manuscript using comment icons 2. Author(s) should effect all corrections as indicated in the manuscript 3. The method used for determining chlorophyll content and type should be included 4. Tables should be properly placed in the result section as indicated 5. The journal style and format of presenting references should be adopted 6. The names of all journals cited in the manuscript should be written in full and not abbreviated to ease cross referencing and citation count	The issues raised here have been attended to.
Optional/General comments	Good presentation	Thanks.

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)*	