



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_48449
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of GA <sub>3</sub> , spacing and nutrient sprays on growth and flowering in snapdragon ( <i>Antirrhinum majus</i> L.) cv. Rocket Pink
Type of the 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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The manuscript is accepted with minor changes. It has good statistical support and the parameters evaluated are adequate.</b></p> <p><b>Title:</b> Is ok</p> <p><b>Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is repetitive and large &gt;300 words.</li> <li>2. Add information about conclusion.</li> </ol> <p><b>Introduction:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To write the objective of this study.</li> <li>2. Little corrections were done in the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Materials and methods:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To describe the main agronomic characteristics of Rocket Pink snapdragon varieties.</li> <li>2. To explain the chemical content of CalMax product.</li> <li>3. Little corrections were done in the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>Results and Discussion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Write together results and discussion because is repetitive a lot of information.</li> <li>2. Some corrections were done in the manuscript.</li> <li>3. In general results and discussion are good with proper evidences.</li> <li>4. Tables are clear and explicative.</li> <li>5. Some corrections were done in the manuscript.</li> </ol> <p><b>References</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They are complete</li> <li>2. Write the references in accordance with the rules of this Journal. The corrections were done in the manuscript. Are missing data in some reference. Please check.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> 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 his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i><b>Raúl Leonel Grijalva-Contreras</b></i>
Department, University & Country	<i><b>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias , México</b></i>