



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_19468
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Palestinian colored-table-grape cultivars by means of morphological and pomological descriptors
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	1. More detail description on the material and each methods used in this study is needed. 2. More description on the characteristics of each table results is necessary to emphasize the similarities and variations of all cultivars. 3. In fact, the results and discussion section can be combined.	1. <u>More details / materials and methods:</u> A) There are two references (no. 10+11) which already mentioned in mat. and methods covering the whole details which needs minimum of two to three pages to describe the 39 descriptor. In addition, these descriptors are well known by the plant scientists and breeders worldwide B) Actually, the short mat. and methods that mentioned in my manuscript is going in parallel with almost all of the similar relevant published works. 2. <u>More description / tables:</u> I have revised again the tables' and I found that, almost, each descriptor from the 39 examined descriptors "presented in the tables" was clearly mentioned in the result section. 3. <u>Combination of results and discussion:</u> a) The journal condition doesn't require the combination of the results and discussion. b) It is well known that, having separate results and discussion is stronger, clearer, and richer. Therefore, I didn't find and reason to combine them.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	4. An added section on Conclusions is essential to elevate this research article from a “research report” to a “research paper”. 5. Why all the genotypes are absence with “petiole sinus limited by veins” and “Tooth at petiole sinus? If that is really the case, both columns can be deleted from Table 2 and be replaced with one sentence in the text. 6. Similarly with “number of lobes” in Table 1, the column can be deleted and replaced with a sentence mentioning all the genotypes have more than seven lobes is adequate in the text. 7. What is the critical genetic distance for quantifying similarity and variation? 8. With only 2 similarities out of 19 genotypes, does it really save time and efforts in future breeding program?	4. <u>Conclusion:</u> Conclusion was added to the manuscript and highlighted in yellow colour. 5. <u>Petiole sinus and tooth:</u> I completely agree. Both columns were deleted from Table 2 , and accordingly presented in the result section. 6. <u>Number of lobes:</u> As in the comment number 5; the column “number of lobes” in Table 1 was deleted. 7. In fact, the most similar and divergent genotypes were clearly mentioned and discussed in the two sections of results and discussion. 8. The answer is yes, since any breeding program needs many years of efforts, labour, costs, land, etc.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. A better word for “relatedness” is ‘related’. 2. Why is “ added in front of Halawani? 3. “7,5” may be changed to “7.5”. 4. Since “absence” and “presence” are used in Table 2, the sentence in Line 52 is not necessary.	Some of the suggested linguistic changes were done.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The objective of this study is quite clear and meaningful. The study approach is adequate. The study results are logical and quite substantial. The article is also well-referenced. However, the written content is absolutely too brief. The two only written paragraphs in the Material and Methods, and Results sections are identical. About six paragraphs have been used in the Discussion section.	SOS!! Well.... By mistake, it seems that, the results part was forgotten to be added in the submitted manuscript form. Please see the new version which includes the whole results. Thanks a lot for this comment.