

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_111435</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Climate Change and Phenological Monitoring of the Indigenous Godello Variety in a Territory of Heroic Viticulture and Biosphere Reserve</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the contents of this article is important. Phenology facing climate change is an important research area in ecology, this article analyses the phenological changes of local vegetation, the results are interesting.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable.</p> <p>3. No, the abstract is to some extent tedious. It should discuss the background briefly, but should mainly focus on the discoveries of the current study. However, the authors just stated the purpose of this study, but the main results are not shown in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript is clear.</p> <p>5. Yes, the analyses are correctly carried out.</p> <p>6. No, many references are published about 10 years ago, recent references should be included.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the writing is good.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Zepeng Sun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>China Mobile Industrial Research Institute, China</b>