

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95240
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on Graft Compatibility and Effect of Grafting on Growth of Brinjal (<i>Solanum melongena</i> L.)
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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The MS has significant findings. The technology may be utilized to develop a resistant egg-plant against root knot nematode.</p> <p>2. Yes, but can be improved as "Studies on Graft Compatibility and Effect of Grafting and Development of Root Knot Resistant Brinjal (<i>Solanum melongena</i> L.)".</p> <p>3. Yes with correction (mentioned in the MS).</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes, but incorporate the corrections as suggested in MS.</p> <p>6. Add some latest references, otherwise sufficient.</p> <p>7. The work is short, it would be better if accepted as short communication otherwise ok.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language seems to be suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The paper may be accepted with minor correction/ incorporation as suggested.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arshad Anwer
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India