

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_109090</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of clusterbean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) Yield, Temperature and relative humidity profile under different growing environments</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The manuscript presents results that make it possible to understand meteorological variations during the cultivation of the species. This contributes to the understanding of the phenotypic responses of genotypes to meteorological variations.</p> <p>No, need to be more objective.</p> <p>No, at no point is the objective of the study directly stated. Conclusions need to respond to the objective.</p> <p>More details should be provided in the methodology. It is not possible to replicate the study with the information provided.</p> <p>Yes. However, it is strongly suggested to provide more information on the methodology.</p> <p>No (Add at least 20 references related to the work. A better discussion of the results is needed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Review English	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The topic of the article is relevant. However, improvements are needed to understand how the authors arrived at the results. For example, how the meteorological variables were obtained. What statistical analyses were used?</p> <p>At no point is the objective of the study directly stated.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Murilo Vieira Loro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Brasil</b>