

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126919
Title of the Manuscript:	EXPLORING MICROGRAVITY'S EFFECT ON SEED GERMINATION AND GROWTH OF PLANTS
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I liked the idea of manuscript as it can contribute to scientific community as following: Studying the effects of microgravity on plant growth can lead to insights into optimizing plant development and productivity in terrestrial environments. Understanding how plants adapt to the extreme conditions of microgravity can provide valuable information for developing crops that are more resilient to environmental stresses like drought, salinity, and extreme temperatures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes title looks suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	According to my opinion ideal abstract is of 200-250 words. But it looks like too much extensive in length should be limited to 200-250 words only. Why few lines are starting with a new paragraph? Adjust in one paragraph only.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, I think structure and subsections are appropriate. But conclusion section should be at least and future directions heading should be merged into discussion or in case of separate heading then it should be before conclusion.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Abstract is too long. How is it possible you don't have any citations in discussion portion? Then what are they discussing if they are not interlinking different studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and satisfactory but they haven't followed same styles. References should be checked again and follow same style for all as per journal guidelines.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Looks like satisfactory.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Ammar Amjad
Department, University & Country	Institute of Horticultural Sciences, University of Agriculture, Pakistan