

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123822
Title of the Manuscript:	Emerging Trends in Plant Growth Regulators: Innovations and Applications
Type of the Article	Review

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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>
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 idea of review is appreciable. Content-wise the manuscript is scientifically acceptable. The manuscript is well composed and deliver updation in the sector.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, title is 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.	Abstract is comprehensive (except the initial line which contain the entire title) Key words could be modified/ improved.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, Subsections and structure of manuscript is appropriate.	
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.	Manuscript is scientifically robust and technical sound. The components and content delivery is proper. Content-wise updated. The analysis is proper and well structured.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Yes, references are sufficient but can add some more recent references. Tarun Kumar, Rinu, Rajesh Sethiya, Praddyum, Shikha Thakur and Saurabh. A comprehensive review of Plant Growth Regulators (PGRs) and their impact on flowering and ornamental crops with insights into effective application methods. <i>Int. J. Adv. Biochem. Res.</i> 2024;8(2S):254-267. DOI: 10.33545/26174693.2024.v8.i2Sd.553 Hafeez, M.B., Ghaffar, A., Zahra, N. <i>et al.</i> Exogenous Application of Plant Growth Regulators Improves Economic Returns, Grain Yield and Quality Attributes of Late-Sown Wheat under Saline Conditions. <i>Int. J. Plant Prod.</i> 18, 217–228 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/s42106-024-00285-4	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, Language quality is fair, Suitable for scientific scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	The Article should be accepted with minor revisions.	

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:	Dipak K. Koche
Department, University & Country	Shri Shivaji College of Arts, Commerce and Science, India