

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJBCRR_124707 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | PP packaged 10 days cold stored rose cut flowers cv. Bordeaux influenced by different pulsing solution |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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. | Flower shelf life is one of the most important considerations for storing and marketing. Generally, the shelf or vase life of flowers is very short. It is important to study the vase life-increasing treatment, so the manuscript was highly useful for the scientific knowledge. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | No, Influence of different pulsing solutions on polypropylene packaged cut rose cv. Bordeaux | |
| 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. | No, provide purpose of study, treatment details, results and final conclusion in abstract. Delete table mentioned in an abstract. | |
| 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. | Mention why the rose-cut flowers are packaged in a polypropylene sheet before the pulsing (generally the flowers were stored after the pulsing treatment). Have any specific reasons? | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | Yes, the cited articles are sufficient and recent. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, May check with professionals | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | Check the spelling of methos in a heading Add year of experiment in materials and methods Mention unit of vase life in table 2 The titles of tables 1 and 2 may be changed to physiological or biochemical parameters instead of giving all the parameters in the title | |

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: | M. Kumaresan |
| Department, University & Country | Vels Institutes of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies, India |