

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_118409
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF MELIA COMPOSITA WILLD. SEEDLING IN ROOT TRAINERS UNDER TWO DIFFERENT GROWING CONDITIONS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://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>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. Yes, the study aim is community based</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is suitable</p> <p>3. The Abstract is not comprehensive b/c it requires revision it must be include introduction, objective, methodology, result and conclusion or recommendation</p> <p>4. Yes, but it requires some revision</p> <p>5. Yes, not at all</p> <p>6. No because the reference use in this manuscript is out dated or too old</p> <p>Overall reflection The manuscripts is relatively well prepared and well written with good flow but it requires need major revision because, there are repeated ideas and unnecessary explanations, problem of coherent, incomplete statement and lack of clarity in expression.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language quality is relatively good as to me</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Workina Geleta
Department, University & Country	Wollega University, Ethiopia