

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121454
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of chemical mutagens on growth of chrysanthemum (<i>Dendranthema grandiflorum</i>) var. Flirt
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This draft presents a well-structured and thorough investigation into the effects of chemical mutagens on chrysanthemum growth. With some refinement in clarity, consistency, and deeper discussion of the results, this study has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the field of horticultural science. Great job!	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	I will suggest alternative title as "Chemical mutagens and their impact in modifying the growth of chrysanthemum (<i>Dendranthema grandiflorum</i>) var. Flirt"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a clear overview of the research conducted, including the purpose, research methodology, results, and discussions. However, some sentences could be broken down for better readability. For example, the sentence starting with "Applying E.M.S. and colchicine treatments..." can be split into two sentences to improve clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is appropriate and well organized	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound. The study employs a well-structured experimental design, utilizing a randomized block design (RBD) with multiple treatments and replications, which enhances the reliability and validity of the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a reasonable number of references with relevant literature. It would be helpful if the recent trends on mutation breeding are added.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is appropriate for a scholarly article.	
Optional/General comments	A brief introduction about the limitations of mutagenic agents and future research directions helps readers in understanding the context.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	G Sri Hari
Department, University & Country	ANGRAU, India