

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_108381
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Seedling Growing Media on Growth, Quality and Vigour of Tomato and Cabbage Seedling and Subsequent Performance in the Main Field
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. If the researcher properly organizes the paper, it will help scientific communities as well as professionals related to this field of study.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is too long. It should be direct, clear, brief, precise and inclusive. It is better if entitled as "Effect of Different Seedling Growing Media on Tomato and Cabbage Seedling". Others like growth, quality and vigour should be presented under specific objectives.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. But it must contain the summary of whole paper such as objective, methodologies followed, findings, conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>4. The manuscript is not organized well. It lacks heading and sub-headings. It should be organized like 1, 1.1, 1.2 and etc.</p> <p>5. The manuscript lacks scientific flow. (Title, statement of the problem, objectives (General and specific), research question, hypothesis, research design etc.). Also it is better if scientific table is used.</p> <p>6. The author used less references and most of them are very old. The author should have to use more recent citation from 2015 to recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Punctuation and spelling errors are found in the manuscript. As I think for scientific purpose it needs more modification.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In my view, although the finding parts is good, the logical structure of the manuscript is poor. Therefore the author has to rectify the stated comments accordingly.</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:	Kenasa Degefa Alemu
Department, University & Country	Jimma University, Ethiopia