

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97026
Title of the Manuscript:	Morpho-metric analysis of leaf and fruit of some selected mulberry accessions: A preliminary measure for diversity analysis
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.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. The manuscript is important for the scientific community for its contribution in mulberry plant genetic knowledge 2. the title of the article is suitable for me 3. the abstract of the article is comprehensive, but it must be improve in structure : objective-methodology-results 4. subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. the manuscript is not scientifically correct for the following reasons: -the abstract is not well structured: absence of objective, methodology -Lack of clear objective in the introduction -The material and methods section does not give the minimum details on how the study was done to allow a better appreciation of the results. <i>The writing style and methodology must be improved to make the manuscript scientifically acceptable</i> 6. The references are acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahamadi Hamed Ouedraogo
Department, University & Country	Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso