

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121231
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of pruning interval and height for better growth and loose flower production in Rose (<i>Rosa gruss-an-teplitz</i>) under open field conditions.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript makes a significant contribution to the scientific community by addressing floriculture demands. The research provides novel insights into pruning, which can influence both theoretical perspectives and practical applications. The methodology is rigorous, and the results are presented clearly, enhancing the overall credibility and relevance of the study. In the introduction, the sentence "This study aims at exploring the impact of X on Y" can be revised to "This study aims to explore the impact of X on Y" for better readability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is suitable and accurately reflects the content and scope of the research. It effectively highlights the main focus and is likely to attract the interest of the relevant audience. No changes to the title are necessary.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the key objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, it would benefit from a brief mention of the broader implications of the findings and potential future research directions. This addition would provide better context for readers. The phrase "The results indicate that there is a significant effect of X on Y" could be revised to "The results indicate a significant effect of X on Y" for conciseness.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and logically organized. Each section transitions smoothly, making it easy for the reader to follow the research progression. No major structural changes are needed.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design and data analysis are rigorous, with clearly described methods that allow for reproducibility. The authors address potential limitations and provide a thorough discussion of the findings within the context of existing literature, which enhances the manuscript's reliability. In the methods section, consider revising "The samples was collected from" to "The samples were collected from" to correct the subject-verb agreement. In the discussion section, the sentence "This result is in line with the previous studies by Author et al." can be revised to "This result aligns with previous studies by Author et al." for clarity and conciseness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are not sufficient and recent, not covering a broad range of relevant literature. Additional references are necessary.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, with clear and concise language. Minor grammatical and typographical errors, if any, can be addressed!!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the results section, the phrase "The data shows" should be corrected to "The data show" to ensure proper subject-verb agreement. • Consider changing "In order to" to "To" throughout the manuscript to make sentences more concise. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a significant contribution to the field and is of high quality overall. The authors have demonstrated a deep understanding of the topic and provided valuable insights that will benefit the scientific community. I look forward to seeing this work published and its impact on future research.</p> <p>Corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure consistent use of terminology throughout the manuscript. For example, if "X factor" is used in the introduction, maintain the same term in subsequent sections. • Double-check the figures and tables for any labeling errors or inconsistencies. <p>These corrections should help improve the clarity, readability, and overall quality of the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	<p>There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.</p>

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Nidhi Sukhija</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>CSB-CTR TI, India</p>