

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)
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.	Scientifically, it is highly fascinating and worthy of reference in research, but it must be added and provide in-depth information about what the focus of this research is.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Evaluation of miniature roses (Rosa chinensis minima) in Prayagraj's agro-climate conditions."	
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.	In the abstract, add general information about the research variables, research questions, types of methodology used, data analysis techniques	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Moderate	
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.	Based on this manuscript, I found the results of this research such as "The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design with twelve varieties replicated thrice. Varieties were Red Hot, Magic Carousel, Rosy, Calpoly, Beauty Secret, Hocky Pocky, Ruby Ruby, Rainbow's End, Jet Trail, Cricket, Black Jade, and Jeane Kennealy. Variety Ruby Ruby emerged promising for parameters like plant height (25.9 cm), number of branches (10.9), duration of flowering (164 days), number of flower per plant (285.9) whereas, plant spread (31.4 cm ²) was better in variety Jeane Kennealy. Variety Red Hot performed better in days taken to first flowering (32 days). Bud diameter (1.1 cm) was better in variety Magic" so that's why I think this manuscript is scientifically.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please add references for the last 5 years, it would be nice if the references used could add new knowledge for other readers and researchers	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it can be	
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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Darmawan Budiyanto
Department, University & Country	Universitas Tridinanti, Indonesia