

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_92206
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of micronutrients (Boron & Zinc) on growth, flowering and quality of carnation (Dianthus caryophyllus L.) under naturally ventilated polyhouse conditions of Prayagraj
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>)

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>1. MATERIALS AND METHODS</p> <p>I suggest declaring the statistical test to verify a significant difference between the treatments of the experiments that conducted the analysis of variance.</p> <p>The question that arises is whether there is a significant difference between treatments.</p> <p>2. RESULTS...</p> <p>"Days taken to bud opening: Significant difference was noted for days taken for bud opening from days taken to bud initiation..."</p> <p>"Foliar application of 0.1 per cent boron at monthly intervals after planting resulted in significantly better plant height, number of leaves per plant, number of shoots per plant, number of internodes per shoot"</p> <p>How to declare significant difference if no inference procedure was applied. I suggest the Tukey test, to the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>This is a descriptive study, so one should not speak of a significant difference.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Haydee Serrão Lanzillotti
Department, University & Country	State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil