

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_97964</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Studies on Flowering Characteristics and Floral Morphology of Some Jamun Genotypes (<i>Syzygium cuminii</i> Skeels) under Semi-arid Lateritic Belt of West Bengal</b>
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> )

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>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></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>It provides useful data on flowering characteristics and floral morphology of some jamun genotypes.</b></li> <li>2. <b>The title is suitable.</b></li> <li>3. <b>The abstract was not sufficiently informative.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Needs to be re-organized</b></li> <li>5. <b>The scientific content of the manuscript is low</b></li> <li>6. <b>The references are inadequate.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>The language needs significant improvement</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The discussion and conclusion must be re-written.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b> The conclusion must be re-written. It should be noted that Conclusion is not a summary of the research by just stating the main findings. NO!!! The conclusion is the last thing that your reader will see, so it should be memorable. A good conclusion will review the key points of the research and explain to the reader why the information is relevant, applicable, or related to the scientific world as a whole. The best way to start a conclusion is simply by restating the problem statement in different words. The next step is to review or reiterate the key points of the research as a whole. Explain why your findings are relevant to your field of research and how your research intervenes within, or substantially revises, existing scholarly knowledge or debates. What is the take-home message for the reader?</p> <p><b>Discussion</b> The function of the Discussion is to interpret your results in light of <a href="#">what is already known</a> about the subject of the investigation. Also to explain your new understanding of the problem after taking your results into consideration. In the discussion you should EXPLAIN the results and the scientific principles that have been established or reinforced. <i>Compare</i> the results with those reported in the literature. (Show how your results agree or contrast with previous work). Use the literature to <i>support</i> a claim, hypothesis or deduction you make from the results. Make a claim for how the results can be applied more generally (deduction) and conclude based on reasoning from the results. What generalizations can be drawn? Are there any theoretical/practical implications of your work? The discussion must rest firmly on the evidence presented in the results section. Continually refer to your results (but do not repeat them). <b>Do not waste entire sentences restating your results; if you need to remind the reader of the result to be discussed, use "bridge sentences" that relate the result to the interpretation:</b>  <b>"The slow response of the lead-exposed neurons relative to controls suggests that...[interpretation]".</b>  Organize the Discussion to address each of the experiments or studies or objectives for which you presented the results. Discuss each in the same sequence as presented in the Results, providing your interpretation of what the results mean in the context of the problem. The discussion must also place emphasis on the implications of the key findings, the way forward for their practical utilization</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

	and their limitations.	
--	------------------------	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<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:	<b>Daniel Obeng-Ofori</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Catholic University of Ghana, Ghana</b>