**Editor’s Comment:**

I have reviewed the second version of the manuscript

My evaluation is as follows:

General comments

The focus of the study is topical and relevant. The reviewers have scored the manuscript highly and

have given a verdict of publish with minor corrections. However, the study has weaknesses that cannot

be ignored and the authors have not responded fully to the reviewer concerns. Please note my concerns

below that authors should correct before the paper can be published.

Tilte

The title is appropriate.

Abstract

The abstract should be summerised to 300 words. Further, the authors did not respond to the reviewer

comment requesting authors to make the abstract stand alone, thus provide the purpose of the review,

literature search methods, main findings and conclusions. Authors have not responded to this

commend.

Key words

The authors should include the most important constraints in soybean production.

Introduction

 Both reviewers have indicated that the manuscript can be improved by providing references.

Actually, only two references Garrett &amp; Woodsworth, 1969 and Jamanal &amp; Syed, 2017 plus the

anonymous three references in the whole manuscript. There is need to add more references.

 There are many facts that are stated but not referenced and can help work this out. For example;

 Why are the authors using anonymous as an author?

 The fact statements in the text such as areas under soybean production, the importance

of soybean and the health benefits of soybean.

 The authors have not provided the objectives of the study.

Results and Disscusion

 Authors should discuss the implications of their results in relation to other studies.

 This should be based on the objectives of their study.

 The authors have indicated in the abstract that Garrett’s score was to be used to interpret data.

Authors should address this by providing how what this means based on the study results.

Conclusions

 This should be supported by data.

References

 Once the reported facts have been referenced, they will be sufficient.

 All cited references in the text must be cited in the list and vice versa. For example: Hazari &amp;

Khobarkar, 2015; Agada, 2014; Goldsmith, 2008; Chen, 2024; Majidian et al., 2024; Mishra et

al., 2021 and Singh et al., 2024 are in the list but not in text.

Editorial decision.

The authors should perfom a major revision of the manuscript before it can be published. I am willing to have a look after the revision.
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