

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_103039
Title of the Manuscript:	Sowing time, plant growth regulators and their application scheduling affect quality traits of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)
Type of the 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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In my opinion, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. The results of the study give useful information to other researchers. The title of the article is suitable. Another possible title would be 'The investigation of the effect of sowing time, spray scheduling and plant growth regulators application on seed quality traits in wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)' The abstract is concise highlighting the most important points of the study. The manuscript is well-structured. In my view, the manuscript is scientifically correct. I recommend including more recent references (if it's possible) complementary to the already existing ones. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The manuscript is well-written using the English language appropriately. I suggest revising the article and correcting some syntax and grammatical errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The experiment was well organised having 63 treatment combinations and three replicates which was a very advantageous point. It is very important to conduct surveys for so important plant species such as wheat as well as investigate the effect of alternative techniques to seed quality. The study is promising and you have to consider continuing it with future experiments.	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anthoula Gleridou
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece