

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_100370
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different IBA concentrations on air layering in Olive (Olea europaea 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. It is relevant but needs to be better structured.</p> <p>2. The summary should be improved since it does not present the objective of the research, the type of statistical analysis carried out and the conclusion needs to be improved.</p> <p>3. Improvement is recommended. Indications are found in the manuscript.</p> <p>4. Adjustments should be made for better interpretation of it, such as citing references in each paragraph.</p> <p>5. Once the adjustment is made, it can be considered again</p> <p>6. He cites the references at the end, but very little is cited within the manuscript.</p> <p>Suggestions</p> <p>Adjust the abstract, remembering that it must meet the criteria of the introduction objective materials and methods relevant results and conclusion. Authors are not cited in many paragraphs used. The tables presented at the end of the manuscript are not called anywhere in the result.</p> <p>The conclusion presented is more results in a conclusion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Daisy Leticia Ramirez Monzón
Department, University & Country	Paraguay