

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102363</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of plant growth retardants on growth, flowering, yield and shelf life of dahlia (<i>Dahlia variabilis</i> L.) cv. Shubhra</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b>  Yes <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> It did not present a summary of the work, but the results. <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> No <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  Only if necessary adjustments are made.  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	See attached file with corrections.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The abstract must be rewritten. The experimental design must be included in the material and methods. The results must be discussed. The conclusion must be restructured.	

### 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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Luiz Carlos Ferreira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal Institute of Education, Science and Technology of the Northern Minas Gerais, Brazil</b>