

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125229
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization techniques for grafting in pomegranate (<i>Punica granatum</i> Linn.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	I congratulate and appreciate the efforts of Authors for doing excellent piece of original research work for mass cultivation and conservation of <i>Punica granatum</i> -an economically important plant of horticulture sector. Different techniques standardized by authors will help scientific community especially growers. Presentation of the manuscript is good. I suggest esteemed editor accept the manuscript as such for publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Alternate Title Standardization of Grafting Techniques: Unlocking the Potential of Pomegranate (<i>Punica granatum</i> Linn.)	
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.	Yes	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically, ethically and technically sound as authors have standardized innovative techniques for efficient means of propagation of <i>Punica granatum</i> . Robust knowledge has been disseminated by authors so that growers will utilize these techniques for efficient propagation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Good piece of work done by authors. Overall presentation of the manuscript is excellent.	

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:	Gowhar Ahmad Shapoo
Department, University & Country	University of Kashmir, India