

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89252
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of plant growth regulators on Growth, Yield and Quality of Watermelon (Citrullus lanatus T.)
Type of the Article	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> )

**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><b>Title:</b> The title, “Effect of foliar application of plant growth regulators on Growth, Fruits Quality and Yield of Watermelon (<i>Citrullus lanatus</i> Thunb.)”, is suggested.</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> This section needs to be revisited and re-written.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> Some statements need reference citations.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods:</b> Needs major revision. There are controversies in the dates of the experimentation and author needs to reconcile this. Nutrient status of the experimental site is very important here. Author needs to revisit and articulate this section very well.</p> <p><b>Plot size?, Planting distance?, Numbers of plant per plot?, Agronomic practices? Experiment: rainfed or irrigated? How did you analyse your data and what software did you use? How did you separate means?</b> These questions need to be addressed.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b> Results on the Tables did not show how means are to be separated in order to know whether values are statistically different or not. This section is not thoroughly explained. Some results are not presented. Titles of Tables need to be concise. Poor punctuation and referencing.</p> <p><b>References:</b> References are relevant. Author needs to go by the journal’s instructions in both “the reference text citation and the listing”. There are some references listed but not cited and vice versa.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Use of different Referencing style inside the text. There are punctuations problem in the manuscript. TRACK CHANGES in the manuscript reveal other comments and observations.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>	<b>Author’s comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>S. A. Ganiyu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Federal University of Kashere, Nigeria</b>