

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_126726
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of watering regimes on growth and yield of Glycine max (L.) Merrill (Soybean) varieties
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.	This manuscript holds great importance for the scientific community as it addresses the critical challenge of climate change and its impact on agriculture, particularly through water stress. The study provides valuable insights into how water stress influences the morphological and physiological traits of soybean, revealing tolerance mechanisms essential for the selection of resilient varieties.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Watering Regimes and Their Effects on Growth and Yield of Soybean (Glycine max L. Merrill) Varieties</b>	
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 methodology is presented in a somewhat dense manner, which might make it challenging for readers to quickly grasp the key points. The keyword "watering regimes" can be removed and replaced with the term "crop yield" to specify the experimental approach.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear appropriate as they follow a logical flow commonly used in scientific articles, such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion.	
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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it is based on a well-designed greenhouse experiment that allows for a controlled assessment of the effects of drought and waterlogging on soybean growth and yield. The study employs appropriate quantitative measurements as well as biochemical markers to evaluate plant responses to water stress. The inclusion of multiple soybean varieties and varied watering regimes enhances the reliability and applicability of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript cites key studies related to the topic, particularly recent and high-impact research (2023). The references are comprehensive and cover various aspects of the research problem (water stress on soybean, the effects of climate change on crops).	
Minor REVISION comments	The language is clear and precise. The sentence structure is appropriate, making the scientific content understandable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	There are frequent errors in the formatting of bibliographic references, both in the text and in the references section. Some authors are mentioned directly instead of being numbered. For example : Mundstock C.M. and Thomas A.L. SOJA Fatores que afetam o crescimento e o rendimento de grãos. Porto Alegre. Faculdade de Agronomia da UFRGS. 2005. Typing errors are also present. For example: Results has shown reduction in number if leaves in soybean under drought condition (Zhao et al., 2017).	

#### 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:	Bidai yasmina
Department, University & Country	University of Oran1 Ahmed Benbella, Algeria