

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95250
Title of the Manuscript:	POST FLOWERING MANAGEMENT USING PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS IN GREENGRAM ( <i>Vigna radiata</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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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. <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>Due to the poor statistical analysis, the results could not be more reliable for reporting in journals;</b>  <b>Yes. The title is suitable</b>  <b>NO, The abstract needs to be revised</b>  <b>Yes</b>  <b>No, The manuscript needs to revise</b>  <b>It is better to use up-to-date references; most of them are old references</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<b>Due to the poor statistical analysis, the results could not be more reliable for reporting in journals; it is necessary to re-examine the results in terms of statistical analysis, then send the results for refereeing.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The manuscript needs to be stronger and needs to be major revised.</b>	

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

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sina Ghanbari
Department, University & Country	University of Zabol, Iran