

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_118927</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Study on Effect of Plant Growth Regulators (PGR) and Training System on Growth and Yield of Cucumber”</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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Although it is a good and small study, the author has to write this manuscript in proper research paper format, not thesis format. Recent data on area, production and productivity of cucumber is required in the manuscript which will make the manuscript more interesting..</p> <p>Revise as suggested – marked in the manuscript</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Revise as suggested</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are not in proper format. References cited in main body are nor given in reference section and some references given in the reference section are not cited in main body of the manuscript. ( marked in the manuscript).</p> <p>The same data is given in both the table and graph, so one of the two has to be deleted, If there were a few more parameters, this paper would have been more effective.</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>This manuscript needs to be written in a more scientific manner.</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>Pradeep Kumar Rai</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SKUAST-J, Jammu, India</b>