

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_95786
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Characterization and Identification of new traits of Soybean [Glycine max (L.) Merrill] Germplasm
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No.</p> <p>No, It needs to be improved with summarised information.</p> <p>The results need to be divided into subsection properly, the original presentation is inappropriate.</p> <p>Yes, but need revisions.</p> <p>Yes, but insufficient. Needs to add some new references and remove some.</p> <p>Serious revisions are necessary, before acceptance and publications.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The font size and style is not uniform. The authors should make sure the uniformity of fonts size and style throughout the manuscript. 2. Revise the title, as there is no new trait identified, rather traits described in the DUS guidelines are measured only. 3. In the abstract, the authors mentioned about the "DUS guidelines " as basis of their studies, but I didn't find that guidelines. Kindly update these guidelines in your manuscript and appendix box, so that your readership can easily understand your experimental outcomes. 4. In the abstract, it mentioned that "Sixteen DUS traits were evaluated as described by National DUS test guidelines", but the very next statement only describe 5 traits that were observed... For clarity, thoroughly revise the abstract. Remove the typo errors. And provide a summarized statement of your findings with further recommendations. 5. Your keywords don't represent the study theme. Rewrite the keywords. 6. The literature review is extremely poor without any referenced information provided that are related to theme of your study. Reorganize the the second paragraph of your literature review, with emphasise on providing a background to your study. At the end elaborate your question and aims. I would like to suggest you the articles "Genetic studies among diverse soybean (Glycine max L. Merrill) genotypes for variability and correlation at Swat" and "https://www.thepab.org/files/2016/September-2016/PAB-MS-160057.pdf" 7. The M&M section did not provide any information about the model statistical analysis. The authors should mention about their model of statistical analysis. 8. In M&M 90 genotypes were mention while results section mentioned fifty.?? The authors should explain. There is no consistency in the number of genotypes, some places its 90 while other places mentioned 50. 9. Describe each part of the results in separate section. Morphological Traits observation and then the clustering results. 10. The author mentioned of clustering but didn't mention how the major groups divided into 2 subgroups, and then further divisions. Update these results. 	

Review Form 1.7

	11. The results are poorly described and presented, while there is no discussion available. Kindly revise the results carefully.	
--	--	--

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:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	College of Plant Science & Technology, Huazhong Agriculture University, China