

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_86582
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutritional value of runner bean (<i>Phaseolus cocccinus</i> L.) grown in Chad
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 1.6

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	<p>Poor abstract writeup: the authors written the abstract in very poor manner. They need to correct it by including the background, objective, methodology, results and conclusions in short and precise way. It is fragmented and has repeated sentences. Two key words are not enough they need to include in more than five key words</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is a need of background information about the production, use and status of runner bean in Chad ➤ The statement of the problem should be stated appropriately ➤ The fragmented sentences should be corrected <p>Material and methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Description of the study place: altitude, latitude, study laboratory, institution should be incorporated <p>Result and Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The discussion part lacks appropriate citations - It lacks well written contrasting and supporting evidences. - Very poor data presentation and discussions - The authors need to cite the source of the energy formula and add discussions <p>Therefore, the authors need to fix these problems</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It lacks adequate conclusion- it should explain the reasons why this conclusion are resulted <p>Intext citation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very poor citation, it should start from 1- the last rather the authors used none-chronological citation - Lacks adequate sources and citations in some parameters like energy content, 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fonts, writing styles, grammars, 	
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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getachew Amare Kefelegn
Department, University & Country	Ethiopia