

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118669
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on the impact of spacing, pinching and growth retardants on vegetative growth and flowering behaviour of Salvia
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article provides a comprehensive overview of spacing, pinching, and the application of growth retardants in Salvia cultivation. Pruning enhances photosynthesis, especially photosynthate, which contributes to plant growth, as evident in the formation of crops with varying spacing. The application of growth retardants can stimulate the flowering process and flower development.</p> <p>okey</p> <p>The abstract is comprehends if enough.</p> <p>The manuscript structure adheres to the required standards; however, the discussion section falls short of the required quality.</p> <p>The author has not yet provided a discussion of the findings, but has only presented the research results. The results need to be thoroughly discussed and compared with previous literature. A summary of the discussion should be included at the end of the paragraph to facilitate the author's conclusion.</p> <p>The literature review is insufficient and out of date. Therefore, it is necessary to add relevant and up-to-date literature that is helpful for the discussion.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>A comprehensive discussion is crucial to elucidate the research findings. Unfortunately, the current discussion lacks clarity and merely presents factual research outcomes. Additionally, references cited within the manuscript are not included in the reference list, while references listed in the reference list cannot be traced back to the manuscript. The utilization of a reference manager is strongly recommended.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Murni Dwiati
Department, University & Country	Jenderal Soedirman University, Indonesia