

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_100368
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of drought tolerant desi cotton genotypes based on drought tolerance indices
Type of the 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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The idea of the manuscript is good, but the written substance will be more complete/full if there is a combination of statistical analysis data with the appearance of spatial data from the results of the analysis. So that these findings will provide additional knowledge about how drought affects the analysis of an object statistically and spatially.</p> <p>2. Particularly in the results and discussion sections, scientific debates (more references) can be added between studies that support the results and are appropriate compared to what different studies are like. In addition, the table can be made into a bar chart, circle or other and the discussion becomes deeper if it is made into one paragraph, not separately explaining the indicators. It seems like repeating what the table has shown. (Line 105 – 330)</p> <p>3. the manuscript is scientifically correct, but the writing on the article is not deep and it is necessary to add related references.</p> <p>4. References related to drought for identification of desi cotton need to be deepened, maybe you can read the following references. Maqbool, A., Zahur, M., Irfan, M. et al. Identification and expression of six drought-responsive transcripts through differential display in desi cotton (<i>Gossypium arboreum</i>). <i>Mol Biol</i> 42, 492–498 (2008). https://doi.org/10.1134/S002689330804002X</p> <p>Singh, S. B., Meshram, J., Prakash, A. H., & Amudha, J. (2022). Drought Tolerant Compact Genotypes of Cotton (<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> L.) for Varied Agro-ecosystem. <i>Asian Journal of Research and Review in Agriculture</i>, 1-11.</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>1. Need to add and if possible bring up a map to clarify the distribution of drought tolerance through DSI.</p> <p>2. Display data not only in tabular form, but appear as a diagram, or something else.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A Sediyo Adi Nugraha
Department, University & Country	Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Indonesia