

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_77083
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of day-length enhancement through night-breaking by artificial lighting on off-season dragon fruit production
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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The paper is written in an understandable style, easy to read for specialists in horticulture/agriculture or common people. The language is fluent and accessible, free from grammatical errors. Title it draw the interest of the reader. Clarity and brevity are important in a title; the detail can be covered in the body of the study. In general the abstract should provide a concise overview of the study: why it was undertaken, the methods used, a summary of the findings, and an indication of any implications. In this case the abstract is focus enough on the results and findings. So the Abstract is quite informative, it presents an important fact to persuade people to read article.</p> <p>The introduction presents the author's argument, and it presents the information and sources used to support this research. The introduction provides the necessary background information and statement of the issue. Literature review is not up-to-date. The goal of paper is sufficiently explained. The research methodology for the study is appropriate and applied properly. Authors have included all the necessary information on samples and methods that would allow other researchers to replicate the experiments.</p> <p>The discussion answers the research problem posed based on the findings uncovered. The authors clearly explain the implications of the study for the field and its potential future applications. Also the authors discuss their results in the context of other published studies.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The section entitled References has some mistakes in written. Also the most of bibliographic titles are not recent; it will be better if the author introduce more recent bibliography titles (I found only four recent titles).</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>Considering the needs and interests of a typical reader, in my opinion this article is adequate and I recommend it for publication, after minor revision.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Roman Ioana
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania