

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104118
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of brinjal genotypes (Solanum melongena L.) for growth and fruit yield characters in Bundelkhand region of U.P.
Type of the 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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Good data has been analyzed, but the way of reporting and presentation is not appropriate Yes It needs strengthening. No, it is not in Journal format. Yes Yes it is enough.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It needs strengthening.	
Optional/General comments	There are many data in the tables that can be better displayed with other statistical methods in the form of cluster analysis and so on. In the results and discussion section, the writing format for most traits is the same and almost copy-pasted. It is better to rewrite the presentation of the results and, of course, do not just confirm or reject them in comparison with other authors and explain their results with the results of this article.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Isa Arji
Department, University & Country	Razi University, Iran