

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ IJPSS_119227
Title of the Manuscript:	VARIETAL EVALUATION OF GLADIOLUS (GLADIOLUS GRANDIFLORUS L.) CULTIVARS UNDER AGRO- CLIMATIC CONDITIONS OF PRAYAGRAJ
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Yes, the manuscript has interesting objective and holds significance for the scientific community.</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? Yes, it is.</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Yes. It contains the most important information of the manuscript.</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Yes, they are.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Yes, I do.</p> <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. No, they are not. The author needs to cite more recent references; there are no citations to works published within the last 5 years, and most of the cited works are 10 years old or older. Additionally, more recent references could be used to improve the discussion of the results, as the author discusses the results very briefly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Considering that the manuscript is well-written, with an appropriate methodology and a good discussion of the results. However, I suggest citing a greater number of recent references.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ismarley Lage Horta Morais
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Uberlândia, Brazil