Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_125594**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Germination and Seedling Performance of Watermelon as affected by Seed Priming**
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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I read the manuscript entitled "**Germination and Seedling Performance of Watermelon as affected by Seed Priming**". I found it interesting, and it could be accepted if Authors provide appropriate answers for the following questions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title can be replaced as "seed priming affects the germination and seedling performance of watermelon"	
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.	Abstract look like a general story of the study the author should focus on result	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of manuscript is appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is written in a very poor English; this makes the text hardly perceivable at places. The manuscript does not follow the rules of writing a scientific manuscript. The style is rather naive, far from the strict academic style. Therefore, I strongly advise the authors to use English editing service; this will make the manuscript more understandable. Also, the authors should consider following some good guides of writing an effective research paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The author should improve discussion and add recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Poor need to improve	
Optional/General comments	INTRODUCTION: This part needs substantial revision in such a way so to justify the need of this study, namely, to present briefly the scientific problem, the background, and the appropriate approach to solve the problem. Irrelevant information should be avoided. Please clearly establish a niche in this section (what is the gap that your study comes to fill in) and clearly state your research objectives. The limited information provided does not support the working hypothesis and the specific goals of the paper. You need to use unique terminology. MATERIALS AND METHODS: The proper methodology has not been done to obtain the results presented. The methodology is not complete to enable another researcher to follow the procedures. RESULTS: results presented are poorly discussed. (1st question) • discussion is very poor. (2nd question) Statistical analysis has been made, but authors did not describe analysis. Also, statistical analysis could be extended to obtain a more detailed conclusion. Figures: The figures are poorly presented. All abbreviations in figures should be defined in the footnote. The authors should have used appropriate units to estimate and measure.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ahmad Zada**
Department, University & Country	**University of Swat,Pakistan**