

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104990
Title of the Manuscript:	Direct and Indirect Effects of Yield Contributing Characters on Seed Yield in Green Gram(vigna radiata.L.)
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript has a positive contribution to the scientific environment</p> <p>2. The title is relevant</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article lacks scientific recommendation</p> <p>4. There are missed parts under methods and materials part like experimental procedure</p> <p>5. Subsection arrangement requires reconsideration</p> <p>6. The manuscript is scientifically good with minor improvement</p> <p>7. There are many reference which are outdated or too much old</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Good	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript lacks recommendation based on its result Old citation could not describe the current situation, these citation should be revised by current one Table formats that the author used is not to the scientific standard, it has to be improved The discussion part of the manuscript is not well articulated and narrated as well as interlinked to the other previous findings</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sisay Mekonnen Mera
Department, University & Country	Assosa University, Ethiopia