Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRCS_46596**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Combining Ability Analysis of Yield Components and Late Leaf Spot Resistance Trait of Nine Groundnut Genotypes.**
Type of the Article	**Original research paper**

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		Agreed with all corrections.
Minor REVISION comments	You need to introduce the following changes: 1) Start the abstract with a sentence that explains what disease is studied, in which crop, and what the goal of the paper was. 2) Abbreviations in the abstract should be explained (LLS,GCA, SGA). 3) In the abstract, LLS tolerance should obly be defined once (disease incidence and severity), and not twice (lines 11, 13) 4) Abbreviate Late Leaf Spot (LLS) when starting the introduction, and do not explain the abbreviation again in other parts of the text, such as in materials and methods (lines 55, 57) 5) Also explain at the start of the introduction which crops are affected by LLS, and in which countries. 6) Mention when and where the study was carried out in the Materials and Methods section (although it is mentioned in the legend to table 4.1-4.4). 7) Correct "106 conidia/ml inoculum" to" 10^6 conidia/ml inoculum (lines 65) 8) Reference list: check uniformity in style of all references. 9) Complete the reference (journal name, vol, pages, …) of Kimani, J. M. and Derera, J. (2009) on line 175 10) The numbering and citation of tables is confusing. The MS is followed by 5 tables, numbered: 3.2; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 4.4. In the text only the following tables are cited: 4.2, 4.3, 4.4. So give the tables the correct numbers and cite all tables accordingly in the text.	All changes have been effected.
Optional/General comments	The goals of the paper are well defined, the experiments well performed, and the conclusions are supported by the results. There are flaws in the format and style of the MS because it seems to be extracted from a major document e.g. a thesis, and was not fully adapted to a stand-alone paper. This needs to be corrected.	Noted

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)*	