

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127060
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Variability, Trait Correlations, and Path Coefficients for Yield and Associated Traits in Soybean (<i>Glycine max L. Merrill</i>)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is an important for scientific community. Section of potential germplasm for breeding purpose is necessary.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Its fine for me	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Please add some information on objective or problems in the 1 st para and also data on result based	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Please follow the journal guidelines while writing the subsections. Please add the missing information, as: acknowledgements and funding sources, ethical approval, competing interests, etc. in the article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, it is scientifically correct, but needs some minor correction/revision on it.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, but need to replace some references (old references) with current references/publications, if possible. Please follow the journal guidelines/format while referencing.	
Minor REVISION comments	It need some improvement.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	There is a need to add some more information in discussion part of the manuscript. Please, follow the referencing style of the journal. References style should be consistent. Also, revisit the manuscript and made necessary correction for improving the sentences. Please follow the journal guidelines/format.	

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:	Anil Pokhrel
Department, University & Country	Nepal Agricultural Research Council, Nepal