

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Sun, Feb 9, 2014 at 10:40 PM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for final decision for manuscript number 2013/IJPSS/8562

Please find attached my decision for manuscript no 2013 IJPSS 8562. My decision is: Return the manuscript to the Authors. In my opinion the revised manuscript and the Authors' comments should be sending again to the Reviewers.

Attached File:

The decision for manuscript number 2013IJPSS8562 entitled 'Effect of "Dextril" ($C_{11}H_{18}Cl_2O_7P$) as growth retardant on tomato seedlings quality' written by RiadZidan, Sawsan Suleiman and Mitiady Boras

After evaluation of all the documents related to the manuscript my decision is: Return the manuscript to the Authors for correction according to both reviewers' suggestions and requirements.

1. In the revised version of the manuscript only suggestions and requirements of one of reviewer are taken under consideration. The second reviewer raised many questions which are not considered by Authors at all.
2. Authors must write (step by step and in details) which reviewers' suggestions and requirements are introduced to the text, and which are not. One general sentence like 'I did my best to correct what the reviewers asked' certainly not enough.
3. The text must be written according to the Journal requirements. I recommend Authors using MS Word SDI papertemplate which is available at http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=general-guideline-for-authors#Type_of_papers
4. The properly revised manuscript and the Authors' comments should be sending again to the Reviewers. The text should be again evaluate because many and quite important corrections should be introduced to the text.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Sławomir Borek

Faculty of Biology, Department of Plant Physiology, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poland

Note: Modification was done in this document ONLY to hide the email id.