

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_117424
Title of the Manuscript:	“Genetic variability of Black cumin (Nigella sativa L.)” under climatic condition of Prayagraj
Type of the Article	

[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)
<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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? The manuscript entitled "Genetic variability of Black cummin (<i>Nigella sativa</i> L.) under climatic condition of Prayagraj", has a scientifically interesting approach. However, it is confusing, and has flaws that need to be revised by the authors, and as highlighted below below. Therefore, I do not recommend publishing this scientific work. 2. Is the title of the article suitable? Authors need to further revise the work title to ensure a significant improvement to the manuscript. Furthermore, authors need to be more objective. 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract needs to be revised as it is confusing. In addition, in this topic it is necessary for the authors to highlight the importance of the study, as well as the biological hypothesis, and why evaluate the genetic variability of black cummin (<i>Nigella sativa</i> L.). Also, what is the objective of the study? It is important to explore this information. Additionally, the authors need to highlight which methodologies were used and employed in the study to evaluate the genetic variability of black cummin (<i>N. sativa</i>). Finally, the abstract lacks the results to be explored between the different types of genotypes evaluated, as well as a conclusion and a perspective on the importance of the study, and what this implies in the future. Finally, the abstract needs to be revised to significantly improve the manuscript. 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Introduction: The introduction is very confusing, and therefore needs to be improved to improve the quality of the manuscript. What are the scientific studies? Explore information better. Is <i>N. sativa</i> an aromatic plant? What are the biological effects promoted by <i>N. sativa</i>? It is necessary for authors to describe the information coherently and contextually, highlighting the importance of the study, as well as the biological hypothesis. Furthermore, it is important to highlight why carrying out assessments about the genetic variability of <i>N. sativa</i>, and how this impacts it. Finally, it is necessary to bring out the objective of this manuscript, exploring its need to be evaluated. Material and Methods: The methodology is very confusing and needs to be better explored to meet the objectives proposed by the authors. Furthermore, what analyzes were carried out? Why? And what is the impact of this? What are the statistical tests? Was $P < 0.05$ considered? Is it necessary to explore the information? The methodology used is not sufficient to defend the results obtained. Results and Discussion: The results are mixed. It is necessary to fully review them, as well as the tables used There is no discussion in this manuscript. So, how is it possible to skillfully defend the results obtained? Is there a difference with other studies? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>It is necessary to further explore the results and discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Is the conclusion confusing? What was the best <i>N. sativa</i> variable? Why? How important is this, and what are the perspectives obtained from these results? Please explore the conclusion further</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientifically correct, as it has flaws that limit the results, as well as the approach taken by the authors.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>The authors did not present references that make the manuscript relevant. Therefore, it is necessary to better explore the literature to ensure a greater approach to the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English needs to be heavily revised to improve the quality of written material.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Leonardo Vitorino Costa de Aquino</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Federal Rural University of Semi-Arid, Brazil</p>