

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121446
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of chemical mutagens on vegetative growth of <i>Calendula officinalis</i> L. (cv. Calypso orange)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	I like that the researcher(s) have tried to perform research that can help floriculturists and plant breeders in optimizing mutagen dosages for improved plant characteristics. I also like that they chose a significant ornamental plant to test effects of chemical mutagens on the vegetative growth. What I didn't like is the restricted selection of traits (other important floricultural traits could have been selected) and analysis of the results (not comprehensive).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable as its concise and informative SEE ATTACHMENT	
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.	No, need to add rationale of the study, future directions and possible impacts.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is appropriate, and the use of randomized block design (RBD) with multiple treatments and replications ensures the reliability of the results. The statistical analysis supports the conclusions drawn, and the discussion contextualizes the findings within the broader scientific literature.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, can add few more recent ones in the discussion section to make it even better. Otherwise, it's also fine as it is.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. Can improve in some places but it communicates well.	
Optional/General comments	Check paper. I have added multiple comments over there.	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dinesh Ghimire
Department, University & Country	Cornell University, USA