

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120363
Title of the Manuscript:	Rootstocks influences degree days requirement for producing quality wine of Cabernet Sauvignon grown in Pune region
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is good from a scientific standpoint, as it provides information about the effect of rootstocks on scion traits.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Effect of rootstocks in berry physiochemical parameters, growing degree days requirement, and high-quality Wine produced from Cabernet Sauvignon grape grown in the Pune region	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	I mentioned some notes for the author in the manuscript file.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The scientific strength of the article comes from organizing the narrative of information, explaining the results, and linking them to previous studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Waad S. faizy
Department, University & Country	Northern Technical University, Iraq