

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121570</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“Effect of Plant growth regulators on growth of Petunia (Petunia hybrida) var. Grandiflora Rose”</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<p><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></p>	<p>The work could be interesting but not in the way it was written and to be published in an international journal.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>No should be <i>Petunia hybrida</i> L.</b></p>	
<p><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></p>	<p>In the Abstract it is not necessary to include the title of the work</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>No. see next item</b></p>	
<p><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></p>	<p><b>There are some important aspects to be corrected</b>            In the Introduction, some studies with growth regulators in petunia should have been cited to justify which ones were used and the doses employed.             In Material and Methods, important information was missing. The vegetative parameters analyzed in the research should have been described. The first two paragraphs of Results and Discussion should be included in Material and Methods and not in Results and Conclusions. In paragraph 3, instead of T6i.e.CCC@650 (50.17cm<sup>2</sup>), it should be T6i.e.CCC@550 (50.17cm<sup>2</sup>) (see Table 1).</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p><b>References are not sufficient.</b>            The citations report 13 studies, however, of these, only 1 refers to petunia. There are other studies in the literature using regulators in petunia that should have been cited. In the text, page 2 the author writes Alhahjoj (2017) and Manimaran et al (2017) but in the references he writes Alhahjoj R.M.             On page 3 of the text he did not finish the sentence: The studies conducted by Amit Kumar et al (2011) and Dhaduk et al (2007).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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>Augusto Tulmann Neto</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Sao Paulo State University, Brazil</b>