Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_85353**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Performance of French Bean (Phaseolus vulgaris L.) under Temperate conditions of Kashmir Himalaya**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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 commen	**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	i. *Each Table or figure must stand on its own with every abbreviation written in full as a footnote, without making reference to the main work. E.g. Wt = weight etc.* ii. *The* "Table 2: Summary of the recorded parameters" *is not relevant and should be removed. And the presented everything in the table without summarizing the results in the table. The table only aided them in their write-up.* iii. *The subheadings* 'DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS', 'ANOVA' *etc. are not relevant, more especially as the authors are presenting results and Discussion together.* iv. *The following "*The distribution of each parameter is shown on the diagonal and on the bottom of the diagonal, the bivariate scatter plots with a fitted line are displayed. On the top of the diagonal and the value of the correlation plus the significance level as stars are displayed" *should stay as a footnote to figure 1 because it is describing the figure or giving lights on it.* v. *It is better to present your findings in the Table or figure as write-up before presenting the Table or figure itself.* vi. *Always explain all abbreviations the first time it used E.g.* principal components (PC) vii. *Be consistent with the style of the use of Figure* E.g. Figure 1 or Fig 1. viii. *And if you chose to use fig, it should be written appropriately Eg.* **Fig. 1** *and not* Fig 1 ix. *The authors however failed to site any reference in the Material and Methods section, having given references of similar work done by other researchers.* x. *When reference by the same authors in the same year are sited, the one that comes first is referenced as* Junaif *et.al.,* (2010a) and not Junaif *et.al.,* (2010b) before. xi. *Please crosscheck the actual date of the reference "*Junaif *et.al.,* (2019)". It is 2019 in	

	the main write-up while it is 2009 in the reference section. *xii.* "This work is supported by the research of Junaif *et.al.,* (2019) and Junaif *et.al.,* (2010a)". ***How did their work support this present study?*** *Authors should state how their work support this wor*	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision needed. The authors should effect all the correction and suggestions stated in the reviewer comment section	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript should be accepted for publication when all the review corrections are effected	

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ogbebor O. Nicholas**
Department, University & Country	**Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, Nigeria**