

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_119832</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Performance of different Dieffenbachia (Dieffenbachia seguine) varieties under Prayagraj agro-climatic conditions</b>
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract may be enhanced to make it comprehensive. Specific objectives and methods, along with brief implications of results and conclusions, may be included in the abstract.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, some subsections need improvement.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. No, the references are insufficient and the majority are not recent. Additional references are needed.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. 1. Abstract may be enhanced.</p> <p>2. 2. Introduction needs improvement. Please state the gap in the introduction and emphasize the need for this study.</p> <p>3. 3. Objective(s) may be stated in the last part of the introduction.</p> <p>4. 4. The Materials and Methods section may be restructured in specifics and procedure to clearly present the step-by-step procedure of the study. The data gathering (parameters) and the criteria for analysis may be presented.</p> <p>5. 5. Presentation of results and discussions may be enhanced or improved. Analysis of variance may be stated in the results and reflected in the table. Implications of results in the discussion may be discussed further.</p> <p>6. 6. Future research plans or studies may also be included in the conclusion as a recommendatory statement.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>Eligio C. Borres, Jr.</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>DEBESMSCAT, Philippines</b>