

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_114943
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of traits associated with drought tolerance in Cotton (<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is scientifically correct and meets the needs of scientific research. The researcher has made a significant effort. 2. The title is very good and explains the content of the manuscript well and clearly 3. The abstract is good and comprehensive, but the results must be explained more clearly and the results obtained must be mentioned very clearly so that the reader can understand the content of the abstract. 4. The general structure of the manuscript is well organized and the researcher followed the scientific writing style. 5. Manuscript is scientifically correct, the research is important from a scientific standpoint, especially since the cotton crop is one of the important and promising crops 6. The references are update. The researcher cited references and previous research well and was able to cover the research topic with current references. The arrangement of references does not require numbering. It is necessary to delete the numbers and arrange the references in ascending alphabetical order 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable, understandable, and clear</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Why was the experiment conducted inside a greenhouse? As it is known, changing the controlled environmental conditions may affect the results of the experiment and achieve results different from what would be achieved under open field conditions. The researcher did not justify why he conducted the experiment inside a greenhouse. - The researcher did not explain the soil type, land preparation, seed treatments, post-planting treatments such as fertilization and pest control, etc. - The researcher relied on very old methods in the analysis and did not refer to modern methods - The references are update. The researcher cited references and previous research well and was able to cover the research topic with current references. - The research objectives are not clear. The research objectives must be clearly and specifically defined in the introduction to the research. - Materials and methods that require further explanation and clarification of exactly how to conduct the experiment. - In the discussion, in some of them previous studies and references were cited, and in some of them they were not cited? - The tables are very long and complex. It is better to clarify the tables, and graphs can be used to clarify the results more - The conclusion needs to be reformulated to arrange it in a way that is proportional to the results obtained <p>The research objectives are not clear. The research objectives must be clearly and specifically defined in the introduction to the research</p> <p>Materials and methods that require further explanation and clarification of exactly how to conduct the experiment</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	In the discussion, in some of them previous studies and references were cited, and in some of them they were not cited? The tables are very long and complex. It is better to clarify the tables, and graphs can be used to clarify the results more	
--	---	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shaker Babiker Ahmer
Department, University & Country	Omdurman Islamic University, Sudan