

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_86543
Title of the Manuscript:	SUPPRESSING EFFECT OF CONOCARPUS LANCIFOLIUS AQUEOUS EXTRACT ON CEREAL GERMINATION PHYSIOLOGY
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>Abstract - The abstract should be concise and informative. Most of the information given in the abstract is not necessary. Does the extract promote or suppress the germination and growth of each cereal?</p> <p>Introduction - The allelopathic potential of <i>Conocarpus lancifolius</i> needs to be reviewed since there have been numerous reports which will be appropriated for reference with the results found in this research.</p> <p>Material & Methods - According to the author guidelines, the method should give adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced. The methods of this manuscript need more clarity in detail, such as the treating technique, the period for testing, and the parameters of the results. - The authors have to describe why 25%(w/v) was used in this experiment. In the abstract, it is indicated that 1.5%(w/v) was determined.</p> <p>Result & Discussion - The authors have to carefully recheck the result data. - In table 1, what is the parameter in the column difference? Which treatment shows the highest plant number in the control column? In the extract column, treatments 1, 2, and 5 show a high number of plants without a significant difference. If the authors would like to present the increase in plant numbers when treated with the extract, the data difference needs to make a statistical comparison. In addition, the authors have to give the total of the seed numbers germinated in both the control and the extract. - In table 2, which treatment among T1 or T3 had the minimum inhibitory effect? - In table 5, is the mean value of T6 +3.885 or +4.885? Which treatment among T5, T2, or T3 had the minimum plant height? - In table 6, is the mean value of T4 +2.272 or +2.722? Please recheck the references about allelopathic hormesis, which could be better explained than self-allelopathic of oat, millet, and sorghum. - Every table needs to show a footnote to explain that the data has a significant difference in each column or in low. - Notably, the data in the difference column of every table needs a statistical comparison.</p> <p>References - The authors need to carefully check the reference style in both body text and reference section.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>- If another experiment is conducted to investigate the range of the extract concentrations, this could explain why only 25% (w/v) was determined in this research.</p> <p>-The author(s) must strictly follow the journal's guidelines.</p> <p>- The writing style of the scientific name is italic.</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:	Varaporn Veraplakorn
Department, University & Country	Ramkhamhaeng University, Thailand