

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119526
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Genetic Divergence for Forage Yield and Biochemical Traits in Sorghum [Sorghum Bicolor L. Moench] Germplasm
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1- Yes, the research is important to the scientific community and contributes to providing an important database on virus infections of economically important crops in order to clarify the extent of the risks to which bean plants are exposed and to encourage researchers to find appropriate solutions for these infection 2- Yes, the title of the article is appropriate 3- Yes, the summary of the article is comprehensive 4- Yes, suitable 5- Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct 6- Yes, the references are sufficient and up-to-date	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 Yes, the language is good for academic communication	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Wael F. A. Alshamary
Department, University & Country	University of Kirkuk, Iraq