

Journal Name:	Journal of Basic and Applied Research international
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBARI_12706
Title of the Manuscript:	Interspecific cross-compatibility of beach pea (<i>Vigna marina</i>) with related <i>Vigna</i> species
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study is very important in that it helps to raise public awareness of the achievements of plant breeding. Genetics and plant breeding play a crucial role in crop improvement efforts. They help guarantee sustainable food production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct. The results are well presented and discussed. However, the authors need to improve the presentation of the methodology shouldThe methodology is well presented. The study design and the statistical tests used to compare the different treatments should be sufficiently presented.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jonas Koala
Department, University & Country	National Centre for Scientific and Technological Research (CNRST), Burkina Faso