

## 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><b>The overall theme of the research is good but presentation is very poor.</b></p> <p><b>No, alternative title may be</b> "performance of clusterbean varieties under different temperature and relative humidity profile".</p> <p><b>Abstract is quite good than other portion of manuscript but require revision</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>No</b></p> <p><b>Comments and suggestion are in the manuscript</b></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>	<p>Not at this stage; require major revision in language</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>The overall theme of the research is good but title is not technically appropriate; introduction, materials and methods and discussion section are not satisfactory and clear. The technical aspect of the manuscript is also poor.</b></p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Very poor, not in line with the context of research, lacking background, research objectives, and significance of the study</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> Not detail and clear, lacks sequential presentation, Treatment combination and treatment details are not presented (detail on manuscript)</p> <p><b>Results:</b> Results is poorly presented and not clear (detail on manuscript)</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Lack of critical analysis, discussion is very poor, not cited with relevant literatures</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nirajan Bhandari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Agriculture and Forestry University, Nepal</b>