

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ JSRR_118425</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Analysis of bio- stimulant effectiveness for improved phenotypic attributes and post - harvest life of Asiatic lily cv. Indian Summerset</b>
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes, New thing in floriculture research</b></p> <p><b>Analysis of efficacy of bio-stimulants on enhancing phenotypic characteristics and Prolonging Post-Harvest longevity in Asiatic lily cv. Indian summerset.</b></p> <p><b>Still required recent literatures which supports this research</b></p> <p>There are so many grammatical mistakes are there try to improve the language</p> <p>Yes, but need another one or two attributes to explain</p> <p>No, Required recent references</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes,</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Clarity and Structure: The paper might lack clarity in conveying its message or argument. Ensure that each section of the paper (introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) is clearly structured and flows logically.</p> <p>Language and Style: Work on improving the language and writing style to make the paper more engaging and readable. Avoid overly complex sentences and jargon unless necessary. Use active voice where possible.</p> <p>Grammar and Mechanics: Check for grammatical errors, spelling mistakes, and punctuation issues. Consider using grammar-checking tools or asking a colleague to proofread the paper.</p> <p>Paper is "average written," it likely means that they found the writing quality to be neither exceptional nor poor.</p> <p>Need to add some photographs of results</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shreedhar Beese</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. Y.S Parmar UHF, India</b>