

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104016
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the effect of biostimulants on quality of cut flower of Chrysanthemum (Dendranthema grandiflora) cv. Denjigar White.
Type of the Article	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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes. Role of biostimulants in floriculture to increase overall production will be informative. Yes Yes Suggested to make few changes Yes Yes Flower diameter and Individual flower weight may be merged Vase life and Shelf life may be marged	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK	
Optional/General comments	Red marks in the Ms may be deleted. If author/s like, may please mention one line regarding – what is the added information in the present experiment over and above the experiments of –Hegde at el. 2016 and Hegde et al. 2020. Conclusion : The entire sentence may kindly be re-written.	

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 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. K. Datta
Department, University & Country	CSIR-NBRI, India