

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124676
Title of the Manuscript:	Varietal Assessment of Gladiolus (Gladiolus spp.) for flowering characters and yield under highland agroclimatic condition of Wayanad
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is good, and with some improvements, it will be more effective for farming community and researchers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Rename the table no.1 as concise as possible rather than mentioning all the factors of the table. Mention the unit for figure 1a, 1b and 1c apart from it adopt only one type of case (For ex. sentence case or each word capital). Data label might be used for each figure (It is optional).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Some scientific corrections are needed in the results and discussion sections, and the abbreviations should be verified for accuracy. The treatment details provided in the materials and methods do not align with the results; specifically, the material lists T4 as Arka Tilak, whereas the results refer to it as Arka Ayush in result section of spike length and number of florets.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References are sufficient but some citations are present in the manuscript but not in references and vice versa.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in the manuscript needs improvement.	
Optional/General comments	Conclusion needs the clarity and conciseness. The conclusion is cursory and does not effectively summarize the key findings and lacks the resemblance with key findings. Conclusion must be written in scientific manner in order to enhance the scope and utility for future researches.	

Review Form 3

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:	Anupam Singh
Department, University & Country	Integral University, India