

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_106261
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality evaluation and economics of gum cluster bean genotypes under Akola conditions
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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, its important and can have impact as it guides/informs on the best performing in terms of high quality and economically valuable genotype of gum cluster bean as one of the leading exported beans in India.</p> <p>Yes, its appropriate, direct and descriptive</p> <p>Yes, within it there is a research purpose, brief description of research approach and highlights main outcomes of importance</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Reference cited are sufficient, however more citations can be made to justify the findings and make them more convincing</p> <p>I suggest that the data shown is not sufficient to justify and make conclusions about the research findings. Data on growth would be relevant to track the crop variety performance in terms of growth and development. Thus the growth and yield related parameters would convince the reader about the quality results and show how growth affected the quality.</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>Include the results on number of seeds plant⁻¹, seed yield plant⁻¹, 100 seed weight and pod yield plant⁻¹ as this parameters has been discussed to have influenced the quality parameters. This parameters and other growth/yield related variables may also assist in justifying the genetic variability of genotypes studied.</p> <p>Just like in the conclusion the study with have been more valuable if it conducted more than once.</p> <p>Between genotype T1 and T4 the athour should be in a position to recommend the best genotype for cultivation under Akola conditions</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Onkgolotse Moatshe-Mashiqa
Department, University & Country	Botswana