

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104797
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF CARNATION VARIETIES (<i>Dianthus caryophyllus</i>) TO MYCORRHIZAL FUNGI UNDER NATURALLY VENTILATED POLYHOUSE CONDITIONS IN 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>In this manuscript titled "Response of Carnation Varieties (<i>Dianthus Caryophyllus</i>) To Mycorrhizal Fungi Under Naturally Ventilated Polyhouse Conditions In Prayagraj", the authors reported the impact of Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhizae (VAM) at different concentrations on the growth, flowering and yield response of three different carnation varieties. Although the authors included an important experiment for their study, some major points should be considered to improve the aforementioned study before accepting this manuscript.</p> <p>1- In the abstract: the abstract was not clear enough. For the following reasons.</p> <p>First, the author stated the detailed location of the study which should be included in the materials and methods section. as was written by the Authors 'The present investigation entitled, Response of carnation varieties (<i>Dianthus caryophyllus</i>) to mycorrhizal fungi under naturally ventilated polyhouse conditions in Prayagraj was conducted at horticulture research field, Department of Horticulture,Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences,Prayagraj, U.P. during winter season(2022)."</p> <p>Second, the authors wrote "Factorial Randomized block design (FRBD) with 3 varieties and 4 VAM treatments in 15 treatments and each replicated thrice." This sentence is not clear enough as the authors performed 5 concentrations of VAM which are 0, 2.5,5,7.5 and 10g VAM/plant (mentioned in experimental details section) and to follow the rule (N= n Factor A X n Factor B).</p> <p>Third, some of the results were stated without final conclusion. Please edit the abstract to make it more informative and clearer to your readers.</p> <p>2- In the Introduction section: In this section the author mentioned a lot of information without any references support (Please see my comments in the manuscript file). Furthermore, the introduction was lacking the objective of the study and the purpose of conducting this manuscript. Please provide those information</p> <p>3- The Authors wrote the last sentence in the introduction "For carnation VAM along with other biofertilizers increases plant height, reduces number of days for first flowering, maximum size and best vase life (Guptha et al., 2004) and acts as best supplement for improving flower production in carnation." This indicate that a previous study was performed similar to their study. (Please see my comment in the manuscript file). Please justify.</p> <p>3- In the materials and Methods section under the experimental details, several information was not included such as the source of the VAM, the source of the carnation cultivars, plant material preparation, soil type used, the VAM application method, results data collection and the statistical analysis software. Please provide these information</p> <p>4- In the results and discussion section under the vegetative parameters the authors presented</p>	

Comment [re1]: How your study is different from this mentioned previous study? Please indicated this information.

Comment [re2]: Please add the objective of your study.

Review Form 1.7

	<p>the plant height and number of branches and discussing this data he wrote “VAM in association with plant roots is known for exploration of more soil volume thereby making the nutrients available for diffusion of phosphate ion and increasing the surface area for absorption of nutrients such as N, K, Mn and Zn (Vijayanathan <i>et al.</i> (2007) in jasmine and Panj <i>et al.</i> (2011) in gerbera).”</p> <p>Please provide the root growth data supporting your hypothesis and/or provide more literature showing that VAM was able to increase the plant height and number of branches.</p> <p>5- Under the floral parameters and yield parameter the author suggest that the mycelia enhance the soil as he wrote “VAM might have led to enhanced uptake and transportation of available water and nutrients like P, Zn, Fe, Mg and C.....” and “.....improving the availability of P and enhancing the uptake of certain minerals (Zn and S) including P and water”. Please provide soil analysis before and after treatment to further support your data.</p> <p>6- Data presented in table 1, the authors didn't indicate the level of CD value (5% or 1%) also the significant differences of the means presented was not presented in the table. Also, abbreviations such as AXB, CD and Sed should be clarified under the table.</p> <p>7- The conclusion didn't state the overall best treatment among all cultivars as the experimental. Please indicate this information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Requires English Revision, the word “varieties” was misspelled along the whole manuscript and other misspelling (highlighted in yellow in the manuscript file).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Rania El-Tanbouly</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Alexandria University, Egypt</p>