

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_129695
Title of the Manuscript:	Gibberellins A4/7, 6-Benzylaminopurine and Prohexadione Calcium Modify Growth, Development and Quality of Raspberry
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Growth regulators and retardant are very important during production of the horticulture products (in field (preharvest) or after harvesting (postharvest). Their effect not only on the yield quantity but also shown on the yield quality. Author (s) chooses a good idea to treat raspberry with these substances and evaluated their effect on the yield and other characters.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Good title	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I suggest to remove subtitles from the abstract	
Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.	Need few corrections that I remarked in the manuscript (attached Word file)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	10 of 55 references are after 2020 and some references are old. If it is possible the author can renew his references. In general, the references are sufficient and good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	good	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Magdi Ismaiel Abdelaziz Saif
Department, University & Country	Suez Canal University, Egypt