

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104871
Title of the Manuscript:	The performance of different warm season turf grasses under Saline condition
Type of the Article	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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript aimed at comparing five varieties of turf grass grown in saline conditions by analysing their performance based on days taken to establishment, clipping yield, mowing frequency and proline content estimation. The manuscript is important for scientific community and can offer valuable information on behaviour of various turf grass varieties under saline conditions.</p> <p>The current title is not effective Alternative title: Performance of warm turf grass varieties grown under saline conditions</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive in general but lacks a scientific touch and has significant grammatical errors. Further, abstract needs to be arranged in the headings as suggested in journal guidelines.</p> <p>The manuscript is not scientifically correct in current condition. The manuscript lacks statistical analysis details.</p> <p>Some references are very old. An effort could be made to replace those with recent ones.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the manuscript, the authors are mentioning the parameters in a wrong and ambiguous sense. I believe, day to establishment should be written as days to establishment, days taken to complete plot coverage. 2. The introduction section is severely lacking the objective of the study. 3. The authors should mention the reason for opting these specific varieties for this study. 4. It is stated that the study was carried out under saline conditions. I believe that the authors should clearly mention if the saline conditions are artificially created, since it is a pot experiment or the soil procured is naturally saline. In the latter case, the authors must describe the salinity levels and conditions of the naturally saline soil. 5. At many places in the manuscript, the authors are using a word 'sever', which should be changed to serve. The manuscript is having a lot of spelling errors, wrong sentences and grammatical errors, such as, using a word starting with a capital letter in an on-going sentence. The manuscript needs to be thoroughly screened for such errors. 6. Material and methods section should contain all the experimental details. The authors should clearly mention how many pots per treatment were there and how many replications were analysed. The details about software used for statistical analysis must be provided. 7. The results of the study should be backed up with proper discussion. The authors must delve into the reasons and explanations that they speculate behind these results. 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is not suitable for scholarly communication in the current form of manuscript. There is significant scope of improvement in terms of language and it is necessary to proof the manuscript for minor to major grammatical errors and sentence formation mistakes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The research that the authors have conducted is not presented clearly in the current form of manuscript. The authors should work on the comments provided and write the manuscript in a scientific way.</p>	

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:	Kompal Gaur
Department, University & Country	Punjab Agricultural University, India