

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99253
Title of the Manuscript:	Effective administration of plant growth regulators in Horticultural
Type of the Article	Review

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community. However, it should be revised before production. The language used in the manuscript is lack of academic quality. Many mistakes can be found throughout. 2. Title of the article does not look complete: An alternative title might be "Effective administration of plant growth regulators in Horticultural Crops". 3. Abstract should be rewritten in concise form. It should be more academic. 4. Ok for me. 5. Manuscript is not scientifically correct at this form. Authors should revise manuscript. For example, they should properly use references. A solid background focusing why this review paper needed should be added. In addition, there should be a separate discussion how plant growth regulators have contributed particularly in yield and efficiency of horticultural crops. These should be well-discussed with recent findings. 6. There should be more recent references. As it is a review paper, always better to compare/contrast and review as much as possible.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is poor. I recommend revising manuscript. There are many mistakes.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeet B Chand
Department, University & Country	Nepal