

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89635
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON GROWTH FLOWERING AND CORM PRODUCTION THROUGH BY GROWTH REGULATORS & CUT CORMS OF GLADIOLUS (Gladiolus grandiflorus L.)
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Title It should be modified according to what the Author will answer in the question explained in point 3 in the materials and methods</p> <p>In The Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1- The role of gibberellins must be precisely placed not only on gladiolus, but as a general cycle on various plants.2- The objective and importance of the research should be stated <p>In Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1- The Author should mention in detail the treatments and factors.2- The method of using GA3, whether by spraying or soaking, and the time and duration of treatment, should be mentioned.3- The researcher should explain why the don't uses the same concentrations of gibberellins for all levels of corms, as he used different concentrations for each type of corms. If the researcher has the data for all GA3 concentrations to all type of corms, he must present it in the manuscript4- It should mention in the methods , time, and the tools of parameters. <p>In The Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">1- The Author mentioned that the GA3 led to the prompt plant high, and this is not true only for the full and half corms and at different GA3 levels, but in the higher concentrations the length of the plant decreased, so the results should be rewritten according to the data,2- Improving the writing as an expression instead of repeating the width for each treatment individually, it should be combined in one sentence (eg: using GA3 at 150 ppm led to an increase in height plant and et) <p>Discussion The writer should enrich the manuscript by adding many references. I suggest adding the following references: https://www.cabdirect.org/cabdirect/abstract/20133057311 http://www.aensiweb.com/old/aeb/2012/1307-1311.pdf</p> <p>Generally The manuscript needs to be re-edited, re-written, and many references added</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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
--	--------------------	--

Review Form 1.6

		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:	Isam Abdulbaset Haidar AL-madhagi
Department, University & Country	Sana'a University, Yemen