

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123986
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding the changes in anthocyanin degradation, ion leakage and Malondialdehyde in the ageing petals of cut gerbera ( <i>Gerbera jamesonii</i> Bolus) cvs Stanza and Rosalin
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript explores the physiological and biochemical changes in cut gerbera petals during senescence, focusing on anthocyanin degradation, ion leakage, and malondialdehyde accumulation. The findings are relevant to postharvest management of cut flowers, particularly in improving vase life, which is crucial for the floriculture industry. The research contributes valuable insights into the senescence process, making it significant for both academic research and practical applications in horticulture.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is appropriate and effectively reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly identifies the focus on key biochemical markers of senescence in cut gerbera petals.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the key findings of the study. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the broader implications of the research, such as potential strategies for extending vase life based on the findings.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that guide the reader through the study. The introduction, methodology, results, and discussion are logically organized, making the manuscript easy to follow.	
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically robust, employing a well-designed experimental setup and providing detailed results supported by statistical analysis. The findings are consistent with the data presented, making the study technically sound. The discussion effectively integrates the results with existing literature, providing a solid interpretation of the findings.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and recent, supporting the research with a strong foundation of existing studies. There are no additional references needed.	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language is generally clear and appropriate for scholarly communication. Minor revisions could improve readability, particularly in simplifying complex sentences and ensuring consistent use of scientific terminology.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**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>Johana Delgado</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UCAB, Venezuela</b>