

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119787
Title of the Manuscript:	Ameliorative Impact of Silicon on Growth of Underground Corms and Cormels in Gladiolus (Gladiolus grandiflorus Hort.)
Type of the Article	Short communication

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Importance for Scientific Community: This manuscript provides valuable insights into the impact of silicon application on the growth of underground corms and cormels in gladiolus, a significant ornamental crop. It adds to the existing body of knowledge by detailing optimal silicon doses and methods, potentially guiding future research and practical applications in horticulture.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Title Suitability: The title is suitable but can be made more concise and specific. Suggested title: "Impact of Silicon Application on Corm and Cormel Growth in Gladiolus (Gladiolus grandiflorus Hort.) cv. White Prosperity"</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract is comprehensive but could be improved by including key statistical results to highlight the significance of the findings. Also, consider adding a sentence on the implications of the study for practical applications.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Subsections and Structure Appropriateness: The subsections and structure are generally appropriate. However, adding a separate "Discussion" section to elaborate on the implications of the results and compare them with existing literature would enhance the manuscript's depth.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Scientific Accuracy: The manuscript appears scientifically correct. The experimental design, data collection, and analysis methods are well-documented. Ensure all statistical results are clearly presented, and consider explaining the practical significance of the findings in more detail.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> References Sufficiency and Recency: The references are sufficient and recent. They provide a solid background for the study. To further enhance the manuscript, consider adding recent studies on silicon application in other ornamental plants to broaden the context.</p> <p>Overall, the manuscript provides valuable contributions to the field of horticulture, and with the suggested revisions, it can significantly impact both scientific research and practical applications.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally well-structured, but some sections could benefit from improved flow and clarity. Consider revising sentences for conciseness and readability. High-quality images and graphs with clear legends and labels will improve the manuscript's overall quality. While the references are generally sufficient, consider adding recent studies related to silicon application in similar crops to strengthen the background and discussion sections. If applicable, include a statement regarding any ethical considerations or approvals related to the experimental procedures.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Ganesh Basawaraj Birajadar
Department, University & Country	FTCCOER, India