

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121633</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Effect of plant growth regulators and micronutrients on growth, flowering and corm production in gladiolus (<i>Gladiolus grandiflorus</i> L.) cv. Nova Lux”</b>
Type of the Article	

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	This manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community, especially in the field of agriculture and horticulture, as it provides new insights into the effects of growth regulators and micronutrients on gladiolus plant production. The results presented contribute to enhancing our understanding of how to improve productivity and flower quality, which can have positive economic and environmental impacts on the commercial flower industry. I appreciate this manuscript because it combines good experimental design with rigorous data analysis, adding tangible scientific value. However, it could be improved by including clear and specific practical recommendations based on the results.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The article's abstract and keywords are missing.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure of the manuscript and the subsections are largely appropriate. The main sections, such as introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusions, are well-structured and cover all important aspects of the study.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically strong and technically sound because it relies on a well-designed and rigorous experimental framework, with specific treatments applied systematically to study the effects of growth regulators and micronutrients. The resulting data were analyzed using appropriate statistical methods, ensuring the validity and accuracy of the results. Additionally, the manuscript effectively links its findings to previous scientific literature, enhancing the credibility of the results and contributing to the current body of knowledge in this field. The methods used are reliable and reproducible, which enhances its value as a future reference for similar research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are several references mentioned in the text but not documented in the reference list, and it is preferable to use more recent references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This research provides a valuable scientific contribution by studying the effects of growth regulators and micronutrients on gladiolus plants. The experimental design and statistical analysis are generally sound, and the results contribute to enriching knowledge in this field. However, there are some deficiencies that need to be addressed to improve the quality of the research: Absence of Abstract and Keywords: The lack of an abstract makes it difficult for readers to quickly understand the content and significance of the research. Keywords are also essential for facilitating the article's searchability in scientific databases. Lack of References: The limited number of references may reduce the study's credibility. It is preferable to add additional references that support the research background and discussion and to refine all references. Improvement of Certain Sections: Some sections, such as the introduction, could be improved by clarifying the research problem more effectively.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Ibrahim Talal Hafez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Damascus University, Syria</b>