

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_90590
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of drying techniques of Dahlia, Larkspur and China Aster
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract is too long with several parts, it should be in the appropriate form according to the journal. - In general, manuscript is written like a technical report rather than an article, so it is strongly recommended to rewrite as an article and have a look to the format of the journal and latest articles in the journal for the revisions. - English language should be checked as most of the sentences are not understandable especially in results and discussion part. - Flowers' name should be checked and written in italic form - In the introduction part, information regarding Dahlia, Larkspur and China Aster should be given and written should explain why these flowers are chosen. - Materials and methods should be written as several parts, such as sample preparation, sensory analysis, storage experiments ..etc. - I could not see any information about the instruments and equipments used in the experiments such as microwave oven, what type of microwave oven was used, what powers, which brand...etc. All information regarding equipments and instruments should be included. - Codes for the treatments are not understandable, a separate table should be prepared and added in materials and methods parts. - F-test was done as seen from the tables, which software was used? Should be included in materials and methods part. - Information of panelists should be given, like how many panelists in total, trained or untrained, male female %s ...etc. - Subtitles of results and discussion are not appropriate, they should be changed. There are unnecessary subtitles like 3.1 Experiment I, which should be removed. - Tables given are not discussed, they should be discussed with citations from the literature. - In Tables, statistics should be involved (and given in materials and methods part) significant differences should be shown with superscripts and standard deviations. - Table 1 can be given as a figure, it is very difficult to follow. - Table 4 is not understandable. - Some abbreviations are not given like CRD and viz. - Conclusions should be given as a text, not with bullets. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Suzan Tireki
Department, University & Country	Ozyegin University, Turkey