

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</i> L. Merrill)
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.	Articles related to crops, foods, their resistance to different factors are always very interesting, especially in areas where food is scarce. It is interesting in the articles to comment on the negative parts obtained from the research (they always exist but are not usually included)... It is interesting to continue the research. It is also interesting to carry out new research on organic fertilizers, digestate for example, and see the results. Today there are not many articles related to the improvement of these fertilizers in agricultural production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is correct with the text of the article, but it is advised that the title should be short, concise and clear. The most effective have less than 10 words and no should include abbreviations or acronyms.	
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.	The summary is correct. This must give a vision of set of work It may contain the answer to questions such as: why was the study carried out? What was done and how? What are the results? What do these findings mean and what impact do they have? The summary can be structured with the sections: objective, design, setting, themes, results and conclusions or unstructured, in which the information is usually given in two or three paragraphs. The first version was chosen correctly. Avoid making it too long or giving too many details, that is what the corresponding sections of the article are for.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is not correct. The correct titles are: Introduction, materials and methods, results and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.	
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.	It cannot be considered a well-formed and structured manuscript, because it does not have the correct sections. As soon as these sections are corrected, it can be considered. Some bugs need to be fixed. It is recommended to publish some images that further clarify the study carried out. Well-chosen images give more coherence and consistency to the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	It is recommended that references be no more than 8-10 years old from the publication of the article. Except one or two if its use is extremely important. It is suggested to carry out a bibliographic review of the studies published in the last 10 years and update the references in the text. Some more references could be recommended. Some more references could be added, up to 40. In the references section it is written Singh RK and Choudhary BD 1985, but in the text of the article it is written 1979, which one is correct? The last reference is repeated, eliminate one of the two.	
Minor REVISION comments	Ok	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations... As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study.	

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:	Noe Anes Garcia
Department, University & Country	University Oviedo, Spain