



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJPSS_8562
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of "Dextril" (C ₁₁ H ₁₈ Cl ₂ O ₇ P) as growth retardant on tomato seedlings quality

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>This is valuable manuscript with good basic results with potential for implementation into practice.</p> <p>The manuscript has been largely improved, but still some of my earlier recommendations have not been well considered. All remarks were and also now are in order to improve certain parts of the manuscript. I suggest some very minor corrections.</p> <p>Title: I again recommend removing the formula from the title and possibly the authors to change the title as suggested bee: <i>"Effect of the retardant "Dextril" on the quality of tomato seedlings grown at high temperature conditions"</i></p> <p>Abstract: I have suggested re-writing of the abstract in a way which, in my opinion, sounds better in English language. Some mistakes have not been corrected: e.g. "a toxic effects" – should be "<i>toxic effects</i>" –indefinite article is not used when the noun is in plural.</p> <p>"Treatment with "Dextril" increased as well, stem diameter, fresh and dry weight of shoots, but it didn't affected leaf number compared to the control." – here there is a grammar mistake – past tense should be "didn't affect" or better "<i>did not affect</i>" – the former is used mainly in the spoken language and is not quite appropriate for scientific text.</p> <p>If the required length of the abstract allows, I would again advice the authors to include the previously suggested last sentence "<i>The results indicate that the spraying with low concentrations of 'Dextril' is promising measure for improving the stress response and developmental characteristics of tomato seedlings grown under high temperature conditions."</i></p> <p>Introduction: I am satisfied with the performed revisions. Thanks to the authors for considering my suggestions.</p> <p>Material and methods: Fine with me. No further revision needed.</p> <p>Results and discussion: I think, at certain places, "may due" should be "may be due to...". Please, check again. My comment on the previous version: <i>In tables 2 and 3, please, indicate what the same letters mean: e.g. values indicated with same letters are not significantly different</i> or something like that; <i>has the comparison between the values been done for each column</i> etc. – has not been considered. It will facilitate the reader if such explanations are added under the tables</p> <p>Conclusions: In the revised version it is again left: "Where supply of low concentrations of Dextril (0.02 and</p>	<p>I corrected what the reviewers asked.</p>



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

0.04%) may produce plants with desired characters could support field conditions.” This sentence is not well written.

Here again my suggestion for Conclusions:

This investigation has produced results suggesting that “Dextril” could be used for enhancing the tolerance of tomato seedlings to high temperature stress. Treatments with low concentrations (0.02 and 0.04%) of the retardant were found beneficial for controlling the growth and for improving the overall quality. The obtained data have strong potential for practical application at field conditions.”