

## Review Form 1.7

m

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_118409</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PERFORMANCE OF MELIA COMPOSITA WILLD. SEEDLING IN ROOT TRAINERS UNDER TWO DIFFERENT GROWING CONDITIONS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes</li> <li>2. Yes</li> <li>3. Yes, but need some editions to full the meanings of objectives.</li> <li>4. Material and methods are preferred to separate into two subsections. Also, conclusion needs to be more detailed and the recommendations is missed, so that it is preferred to be added to the manuscript.</li> <li>5. Yes, it is scientifically correct</li> <li>6. Needs also about 5 new references because almost of it are old.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	The English quality is rather good but it's completely meaning depends also on the final revisions of the paper	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The major editions to be needed in the manuscript is in the way of presenting the methodologies, results, and conclusions,	

[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>Mahmood Khalid Al-Obaidi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Al-Farabi University College, Iraq</b>