

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128981
Title of the Manuscript:	Revitalization of old rose (<i>rosa damascena</i> mill.) Garden for agumenting growth, flower yield and essential oil quality by pruning and fertilizer application
Type of the Article	Scientific research

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript addresses a significant challenge in horticulture—the rejuvenation of aging <i>Rosa damascena</i> gardens to improve flower yield and essential oil quality. The findings are highly relevant to the aromatic and cosmetic industries, offering practical insights for sustainable rose cultivation. The study's novelty lies in its detailed investigation of pruning and nutrient application, presenting scalable recommendations for optimizing growth and productivity in aged rose plantations.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title effectively conveys the research scope. However, for better clarity and impact, a slightly revised title could be: "Enhancing Growth, Flower Yield, and Essential Oil Quality in Aged <i>Rosa damascena</i> Gardens through Optimized Pruning and Fertilization Strategies."	
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 abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear summary of the objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. Minor improvements include avoiding repetition of numerical results, which can be detailed in the main text.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with a well-designed experiment and robust statistical analysis. The detailed exploration of pruning levels and fertilizer dosages strengthens the study. Including more practical field-level implications and potential limitations would further enhance its applicability.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are extensive and relevant. However, incorporating a few more recent studies (2022–2024) related to nutrient optimization or pruning in aromatic plants would strengthen the manuscript's contemporary relevance.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured and written in scholarly language. Minor issues to address: Consistency in species formatting: Italicize <i>Rosa damascena</i>. Simplify technical language where possible to improve accessibility without compromising scientific rigor.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a well-structured and methodologically sound study that addresses a critical issue in <i>Rosa damascena</i> cultivation. The findings contribute significantly to the knowledge base regarding rejuvenating aged rose gardens through optimized pruning and fertilizer strategies. The experimental design is robust, with clear objectives and detailed analyses of growth, flower yield, and essential oil quality. The discussion effectively links the results to existing literature, providing strong justification for the conclusions. While the manuscript is of high quality, some minor revisions are necessary: The abstract could be refined to remove repetitive numerical details. A discussion on scalability and practical implications would enhance the manuscript's applicability. Minor grammatical corrections and consistent formatting (e.g., italicizing <i>Rosa damascena</i>) are needed for clarity and professionalism. Overall, this is a valuable contribution to the field of horticultural science and aromatic crop management. I recommend acceptance after minor revisions.</p> <p>No signs of plagiarism were noted, but a formal check is advised. No competing interests were identified. No ethical concerns are present in the study.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Md Taufiqur Rahman Sarkar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh</p>