

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_104804</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Impact of Plant Growth Regulators on Growth, Yield and Quality of Strawberry (<i>Fragaria × ananassa</i> Duch.) cv. Winter Dawn.</b>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the article is important for the scientific community. However, strawberry is a plant that is preferred all over the world, it's not studied a lot.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable. It describes the subject of the article in a few words.</p> <p>3. The abstract is concise and comprehensive. I suggest adding the meaning of abbreviations into a parenthesis</p> <p>4. The manuscript is well-structured with the appropriate subsections.</p> <p>5. In my view, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient. I recommend adding a few more recent citations (if it's possible).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is well-written using the English language appropriately. I recommend revising the text and correcting a few grammatical and syntax errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study is well-written giving useful information to other researchers.</p>	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anthoula Gleridou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece</b>