

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_112863
Title of the Manuscript:	Evolution of Bio- efficacy and phytotoxicity of Gibberellic acid (GA3) Technical 90% for improving yield and quality in grapes. (Vitis Vinifera L.)
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. The results of the research presented in this article complement geographically and through the doses applied, a treatment option for the grape crop. The article expresses the effects of this treatment with its variants on vine plants.</p> <p>2. The title would be correct if the first word was Evaluation and not Evolution, the latter having complex meanings, some incompatible with the subject.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes the subsections and the structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. The processing of the experimental data and the conclusions are correct, but until these results, important elements are missing: -experimental evidence: diagram or photos of the experimental field, photos of vine plants that were treated with different treatment options at different stages of plant development, highlighting the qualitative differences between them through images; - a map to mark the experimental field on the territory of India, but also the experimental field, possibly in a GIS satellite view; - graphic representations of the experimental data, which make the effects of the treatments more easily visible and understandable. The definitions of the treatments given in Table 1 are instructive. However, I do not understand how treatment 2 differs from treatment 4. The dose of treatment 4 may be other than 50.00 ppm.</p> <p>7. The references are sufficient and enough recent. The list of references and citations must be rewritten according to the Journal Template.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language (UK, US or India) must be corrected with the facilities of the text editor or specialized free programs or higher versions, for example, Grammarly, QuillBot, etc.).There are many typical errors. I indicated them only in the reviewed manuscript.The English language (UK, US or India) must be corrected with the facilities of the text editor or specialized free programs or higher versions, for example, Grammarly, QuillBot, etc.).There are many typical errors. I indicated them only in the reviewed manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering the lack of experimental evidence, the failure to respect the format of the journal template and the numerous grammatical errors that need to be corrected (after you have agreed with the editor on the English, UK, US or Indian language version), and observations on scientific correctness, I have awarded a grade of 6, with the requirement of a major revision, followed by a new review.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research – Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania