

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_122360
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Physiological Trait Analysis of Soybean Genotypes in the Kharif Season
Type of the Article	Research article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title change to Analysis of the difference in growth and physiological characteristics of soybean genotypes in the fall season in (-----)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive, <u>but the aim of the study must be added</u>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and clearly detailed	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments	Yes the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The article is valid for publication after making the minor revision	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Owayes M. Hamed
Department, University & Country	Iraq