

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_100252 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Studies on Genetic Diversity and Principal Component Analysis in wheat germplasm (Triticum aestivum 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

| | 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Comments:</p> <p>ORIGINALITY: (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the paper clearly point out differences from related research? Yes - Are the problems or approaches new? yes <p>For example, does the paper: address a new problem or one that has not been studied in much depth? yes</p> <p>introduce an interesting research paradigm? yes</p> <p>introduce an area that appears promising, or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives? yes</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the work important? yes - Does it advance the state of the art? yes - Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view? yes <p>TECHNICAL QUALITY (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper technically sound, with compelling arguments? - Is there a careful evaluation? Does the paper carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? yes - Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well known technique? - If the paper describes an application, is there: a clear and compelling motivation for why the chosen approach is important? a careful description of the design and implementation of the system? a thorough evaluation of the system with respect to a clearly-stated set of functional and quality requirements? yes <p>QUALITY OF PRESENTATION (*).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the paper clearly written? yes - Does the paper motivate the research? yes - Are results clearly described and evaluated? yes - Is the paper well organized? yes | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>I have some recommendations and remarks:</p> <p>1- What interests your work,</p> <p>2- Try to show more experiences results for each topic</p> <p>3- Use and study other recent methods.</p> <p>4. you should include the section references.</p> <p>5. The paper needs revisions; the second round of major revisions is needed, both concerning the structure and content of the paper.</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | 6. The approach section (which describes the approach) is very brief, the work ofthe authors should be well detailed and clearly presented. 7. if it is possible to add a section where you cite related works and givebackground information 8. Authors must discuss obtained results and compare them with results obtainedin related works | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

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: | Yousef Farhaoui |
| Department, University & Country | Moulay Ismail University, Morocco |