

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120962
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of different miniature roses (<i>Rosa chinensis minima</i>) under Prayagraj agro-climatic conditions
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<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>1. The importance of miniature roses has to be mentioned at least in the early sentences (2-3 sentences) in the Abstract, and also in the Introduction. 2. Some research has been conducted in several countries, especially in China. There are many publications of research results that can be used by the author as references.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title does not mention "What is to be different? Types or Varieties?". Then, I suggest an alternative title: "Evaluation of different varieties of miniature roses (<i>Rosa chinensis minima</i>) under Prayagraj agro-climatic Conditions".</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 not comprehensive. My suggestions are: (1) Add 2-3 sentences at the beginning of the abstract concerning the importance of miniature roses in Prayagraj or even in India. It would be better if the author could put general economic data, and (2) The abstract lacks detailed methodology, only mentioning the number and the name of varieties and number of the repetitions of the experiment. The abstract has to explain how to grow the rose plants, what variables will be counted or measured, etc. The use of the term 'parameter' to be measured is not completely appropriate, and it is better to use the term 'variable'. Furthermore, it would be better if the author at the end of the abstract explained the implications of the best variety of the miniature rose to be widely developed to provide economic achievement.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, but the explanation in each subsection has to be detailed and deep.</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 evaluation of varieties of miniature roses is important to obtain the best variety that can be developed further for commercialization. It will be more significant if the ornamental plants are important enough economically in the areas of the country. All variables measured and counted are appropriate to indicate the vegetative and floral growth of tested miniature roses. I prefer to use the terms "vegetative and generative", instead of vegetative and floral.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are not sufficient and recent. Many recent publications can be cited to make the updated manuscript. The author (s) can easily search articles on miniature roses by using Mendeley (for instance) with the keyword: 'miniature roses'.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/English has to be majorly improved (see correction of the manuscript). It has to be revised for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs to be corrected in terms of its completeness and English.</p>	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Agus Muharam
Department, University & Country	Research Center for Horticulture, Indonesia