

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101916
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Different Dahlia Hybrids for Better Growth and Yield of Flowers under Prayagraj Agro Climatic Conditions
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>)

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>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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Genetics is of great importance for plants growth as it allows cultivators to grow better hybrids for better income. It is important to test hybrids before cultivating them for profit. At the same time, better hybrids can be used in biological research for further research. So the subject is important for the scientific community and of interest for agricultural practice.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title corresponds to the paper contents.</p> <p>3. Yes. The Abstract clearly and comprehensibly states the context, materials and findings of the research.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript meets the requirements of a scientific paper.</p> <p>5. I think some details should be added to the manuscript to meet scientific correctness: in the Material and Methods chapter the growth and yield attributes taken into account for the discussions should be presented; also, the statistical method used for computing data should be mentioned and referenced; the tables should be cited in the text and completed with the symbols for statistical significance of the differences next to the figures. A discussion is necessary on the significance of all the growth traits for plant development and yield, and not only of the number of leaves. The issue could be presented in the Introduction, with respective citations. Correlations between growth attributes and yield, and profit could also be drawn which could give growers the appropriate tools to select the hybrids for cultivation.</p> <p>6. References are fairly recent but rather few. Find more references, if available, especially regarding the importance of growth attributes in relation to the yield characteristics and profitability of crops.</p> <p>The paper should be completed with the economic assessment, as mentioned in the last phrase of the Introduction.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language and English quality are suitable for scholarly communications; very few minor corrections are needed. But the discussions could be more elaborate, as I mentioned at point 5.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I find the subject very interesting and I would like a deeper and more detailed approach. For example how do stem diameter or number of flowers per plant influence the marketability, and further the profit? I think a few words are also needed about what type of flowers sell better: taller? with more flowers per plant? with thicker stems?</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihaela Lungu
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for Soil Science, Romania