

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_117330
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed Characteristics and Seedling Quality of Selected Teak Clones in Eastern India
Type of the 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>Yes, it is. Today the global economy is knowledge driven. For this reason, nations and states across the globe are exploiting scientific facts on available resources to proffer solutions to physical and socioeconomic challenges within their domains.</p> <p>Yes!</p> <p>The abstract is very comprehensive as it captured and summarized all the relevant sections of the work. Some additions and deletions were suggested. They are. There were evidences of coherence and logicity of facts</p> <p>Yes!</p> <p>References were sufficient. Comments regarding them were made</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English is good. Indeed, communication has taken place. Where unavoidable errors were observed, corrections were suggested accordingly</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Not really observed	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Yayo Karage
Department, University & Country	Federal University Dutse, Nigeria