

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_99459
Title of the Manuscript:	In-vitro response of gladiolus (var. American Beauty) towards plant growth regulators using cormel explants
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:

(<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)	This paper shows International Journal of Environment and Climate Change. I think it can be publish as a short communication after revision. In-vitro response of gladiolus has already been indicated by other authors. <u>In vitro Propagation of Gladiolus Plantlets and Cormels</u> <u>IN VITRO CORMEL PRODUCTION OF GLADIOLUS</u> In Vitro Regeneration of Three Gladiolus Cultivars Using Cormel Explants <u>In vitro regeneration of gladiolus propagules</u> The most critical points refer to further detailed methods section and the need for proper statistical evaluation of the data. There is no information on normal distribution. and number of biological replicates for the experiments. In addition, how many times were the experiments independently carried out? This information must be included. Please number lines. Continuous line numbering is most useful for easy reviewing. The language may be checked for its improvement. Figures are not included in the text. Please enter the figure in the correct format References should be rewritten according to the format of the journal Do the data have normal distribution? Please correct the writing errors mentioned in the text of the manuscript Please use newer references	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mojgan Soleimanizadeh
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Hormozgan, Iran