

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99765
Title of the Manuscript:	DUS characterization and evaluation of untapped French bean (<i>Phaseolus vulgaris</i> L.) genotypes
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>French bean is an important legume for the worldwide population. The characteristics of the new cultivars must be analysed according to the international methodology, but also taking into account the local/zonal requirements.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>Subsections and structure are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are sufficient.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is good. Images and tables are offset in the text or superimposed. Please check that the tables and figures are placed where they are cited in the text. In Introduction, please replace "...is christened as..." with "...is also known as..." Fabaceae must be in <i>italic</i> (botanical name) Please add to Reference list International Board for Plant Genetic Resources (IBPGR, 1982) M&M section, please mention the statistical software used for Principal component analysis and some general climate particularities in the area. Results. "...one with carmine red and two with green standard petals (Figure 2)" I think is figure 4. However, figures 3-8 and table 5 are not cited in the text, please insert the references to the figure and tables in the text. At 3.1.3. Fruiting traits section please correct "phsiological maturity" with "physiological maturity" Please decide if you are using US English or UK English, then correct thru the text "colour" or "color" Conclusion. "DUS characterization a useful method..." replace with "DUS characterization is a useful method..." Based on the observations made, is there a specific genotype that can be recommended for planting in the respective area? Please add this to the conclusions. Please check all references: e.g. "58. Voysest VO. Mejoramiento genético del frijol (Phaseolus vulgaris L.). Legado de variedades de América Latina 1930-1999. CIAT, PROFRIZA, COSUDE, Cali, 195 pp. Wallace, D.H. 1985. Physiological genetics of plant maturity, adaptation and yield. Plant Breeding Reviews, 2000; 3: 21-167" is in text as (Voysest, 2000), but what about Wallace, D.H. 1985??? Please correct. (Wondatir and Mekasha, 2014) is 59. Wondatir YM. Feed resources availability and livestock production in the central rift valley of Ethiopia, Int. J. Livest. Prod. 2014; 5 30–35? If so, please correct.....all references.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Filimon V. Razvan
Department, University & Country	Research Development Station for Viticulture and Winemaking, Romania