

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101761</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Performance and Genetic Evaluation of Some Cauliflower Genotypes in Dry Temperate Ladakh Region of India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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> )

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript provides essential and interesting findings to the scientific community especially in the genetic and agricultural sectors.</p> <p>The title reflects the study, and it is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the manuscript is well-written and comprehensive.</p> <p>All the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The authors are required to provide citations and references for the Introduction section. Some of the citations are too old dated back to 1955, 1967, etc. Suggest the authors to provide more recent 10 years references.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The English language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. Extensive English editing is not necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Abstract</li> <li>2. Introduction</li> <li>3. Materials and Methods</li> <li>4. Results and Discussion</li> <li>5. Conclusions</li> </ol>	<p>The abstract of the manuscript is well-written and comprehensive.</p> <p>The authors are required to provide recent citations and references for the Introduction section. There is no single citation provided in the Introduction section.</p> <p>The authors are required to further elaborate the sentence "Standard package of practices followed to raise healthy crop." The sentence is too brief, and more information of the cultivation process is required. Please provide a description on the data analysis at the end of the Materials and Methods section.</p> <p>A sentence mentioned that Analysis of variance indicated that there are significant differences among all the cultivars for all the characters except stalk length, number of leaves for plant and leaf length. Since there were statistical analysis being carried out to detect the significance difference of the manuscript, the authors should display the significance difference alphabets in the Table 1 and 2.</p> <p>The findings of the study were well concluded. Suggest providing a suggestion for future research at the end of the conclusion.</p>	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ch'ng Huck Ywih</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universiti Malaysia, Malaysia</b>