

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_IJPSS_117676
Title of the Manuscript:	Varietal identification and seed quality estimation through biochemical characterisation in Amaranth (Amaranthus hypochondriacus L.)
Type of the 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

Questions	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is important.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable for the objective of the Manuscript.</p> <p>Yes, it is comprehensive; but needs some corrections/adjustments.</p> <p>Yes, the subsections and structure of this manuscript are appropriate for a scientific paper.</p> <p>No, it needs many major corrections/adjustments to adequate it to publish as scientific paper.</p> <p>The references are sufficient and 17 (63%) are recent, published after 2005.</p> <p>The manuscript contain important information for the scientific and rural agents, but needs many corrections/adjustments along the text to justify it for publication as a scientific paper.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English needs an official reviewing to justify the publication as a scientific paper.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript has many serious deficiencies in the Section Results and Discussion that need urgent corrections/adjustments to justify its publication as a scientific paper.</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Frederico Denardi
Department, University & Country	Brazil