

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_92987</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative performance response of ten economically important garlic cultivars in alluvial soils of Punjab</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract:</b> Rewrite the abstract as suggested in the text of the article</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Well written but need to mention specific research gap and research questions why you conducted this research</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b> Presentation and writeup of results section is very poor. Use growth parameters data at different days does not make any sense. Use only one or two growth stages data (Early and late-60 and 120 DAS). Few key results can be presented graphically.</p> <p>Present the results in four heads as growth parameters, yield attributes, yield and genetic diversity</p> <p>Revise the writeup of results and discussion as suggested in the text of the article.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> There is no conclusion. Add conclusion based on the key results and what you want to conclude and recommend from this research.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> Check the comments in the text of the article and correct as per.</p> <p><b>References:</b> Follow the guidelines of the journal</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Good work but lacking research gap and research questions. Need major revision and after addressing all the comments and suggestion this article could be consider for publication. It would be better to review the article again after revision.</p>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Bidhan Chandro Sarker</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Khulna University, Bangladesh</b>