

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_96406
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of cluster bean genotypes/varieties for resistance to <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>cyamopsidis</i> using two methods of Inoculation
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. This manuscript could be important if prepared more carefully. Some revisions are necessary – please look at those highlighted part (green and light blue). Besides, some missing space or extra space should be corrected. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. Overall, the structure is okay – but the subtitle '4.conclusion' may need a blank row on the top; the 'reference' section is different from other sections, not sure if this is design on purpose. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct; however, just curious how variety 'RGC-1066' is better than those previous varieties as the author cited (GAUG 9405, IC202823, etc.) 6. Fine. The author may put some effort to look at the seed yield of the screened variety.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It would be great if the author can read the manuscript carefully and reword it to make sure it goes smoothly.	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mingzeng Sun
Department, University & Country	USA