

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_120270</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Advancement in use of Gibberellic Acid in Various Crops</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors aimed to shed light on the role of Gibberellin in fruit setting, and it also aids fruit development and increases fruit size, making it one of the most significant growth regulators.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Preferred to be modified into " <b>Advances in Gibberellic Acid Applications in Cropping</b> ".	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear to a certain extent.</li> <li>• Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Keywords:</b> Re-arrange in alphabetical order and modify as suggested.</li> <li>• <b>Introduction:</b> Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Improperly arranged in one large paragraph.</li> <li>➤ The introduction has to be re-arranged into three paragraphs i.e. 1. Introduction 2. Significance of the study, and 3. Aim of the study.</li> <li>➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>The aim:</b> Not listed. The aim has to be listed by the end of the introduction section.</li> <li>• <b>The history:</b> Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Clear to a certain extent.</li> <li>➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>The body of the review:</b> Notice the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Clear to a certain extent with moderate comparisons and speculation.</li> <li>➤ Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Conclusion:</b> Some modifications were suggested to enhance the readability and understanding of the text.</li> <li>• <b>Tables:</b> Very long and need more proper design and better organization.</li> </ul>	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlighted that GA is one of the major phytohormones that performs various functions including seed germination, breaking dormancy, stem elongation, elongation of internodes, bolting, flowering, and also parthenocarpy. It also plays an important role in germination, tolerating drought stress, salinity, and other physical stress in various cereal crops, pulses, fruit crops, oilseeds as well as ornamental crops. It mostly has a positive response to any plants or seeds. It is an essential phytohormone for the survival of plants..	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	MUST BE UPDATED as 5.3% (4 out of 75) of the listed references were published in the past five years. The percentage has to increase to at least 35-40%. Old references and lack of updates indicate that the study is no longer a point of interest.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript was expressed in moderate English and grammar. A certain degree of copyediting, proofreading, proper display of the tables, and necessarily updating the references have to be carried out before resubmission to achieve publishing value.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Essam Samir Soliman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Suez Canal University, Egypt</b>