

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_116914
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Open and Protected Cultivation of Cut Flower Rose Farming in Karnataka
Type of the Article	Research

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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1) Yes</p> <p>2) The title accurately represents the content of the article. However, it could be more concise by shortening it to "Comparative Analysis of Open vs. Protected Cut Flower Rose Farming in Karnataka."</p> <p>3) The abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the research. However, it could be improved by explicitly stating the methodology used and summarizing the key findings more succinctly.</p> <p>4) The manuscript's structure is logical, starting with the introduction and moving through the methodology, results, and discussion. However, it could benefit from subheadings within sections to improve readability.</p> <p>5) The manuscript appears to be scientifically accurate, with calculations and analyses correctly performed. However, it could benefit from a more rigorous discussion on the limitations of the study and potential biases.</p> <p>6) The references cited in the article are relevant and provide valuable context. However, some are outdated, with a few sources dating back to over a decade ago. Incorporating more recent studies will help ensure the research reflects current trends and practices.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Literature Review: - The literature review provides a good overview of the floriculture industry and the significance of rose farming. However, it would benefit from a more detailed review of specific research on open vs. protected cultivation, with a focus on recent studies. The review could also provide more information on how this research fills gaps in existing literature.</p> <p>Methodology: - The methodology is well-described, providing information on the sample size, sampling technique, and data analysis methods. However, it could be improved by including a clearer rationale for the selection of the two districts and ensuring consistent terminology, such as using "respondents" instead of "sample respondents."</p> <p>Results: - The results section is comprehensive and provides detailed data on input use, costs, and returns. However, it could benefit from more visual representations (tables, graphs) to enhance clarity. Additionally, more analysis on the reasons for cost variations between different farm sizes could provide deeper insights.</p> <p>Implications: - The article outlines practical implications, suggesting that efforts should be made to educate traditional farmers and develop better cultivation practices. However, it would benefit from a more detailed discussion on how these findings could be translated into policy recommendations or practical applications for farmers and policymakers.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the economic viability of different cultivation methods for rose farming. Its importance lies in its potential to guide farmers, policymakers, and researchers in optimizing cultivation practices.</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:	Mohd Zulkifli Muhammad
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Kelantan, Malaysia