

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_84592
Title of the Manuscript:	Morpho-agronomic dissimilarity of seven traditional varieties of cowpea from Acre, Brazil
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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	NEW TITLE: Morphological and agronomic variabilities between seven local cowpea genotypes in acre, Brazil. ABSTRACT: Abstract should be overhauled to capture the new title. Research Location and the design should also be captured in the abstract. INTRODUCTION: Well presented MATERIALS AND METHODS: Well presented. But the evaluated trait were 20 not 21 (Table 1). RESULT AND DISCUSSION: Result was poorly presented and should be revisited. Discussion and Figures were well presented. REFERENCES: Were very current and up to date. CONCLUSION: Was okay.	We agree with the reviewer's comments and have made the necessary corrections. However, regarding the presentation of the results, we understand that it does not need to be revised, as the script in which it was described is understandably logical. Furthermore, the comment about reviewing the presentation of results is superficial, as there are no suggestions on how it could be presented. The trats analysed were in fact 21. In the manuscript construction procedure, table 1, which describes the trats, was incomplete. The error was corrected by inserting the missing trat in table 1 and can be verified by the yellow highlight.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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)	