

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_125993
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies On The Influence Of Growing Media, Pinching And Growth Regulators On Vegetative Growth And Flowering Parameters Of Fuchsia x hybrida
Type of the Article	

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (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.	The substrates used and the pinching methods could be something new. The work is not written carefully, so the author has to work on.	
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.	No. In the abstract are some abbreviation, so when you read, you don't understated the meaning of this.	
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.	Not so well, because in the Material and Method chapter is missing the statistical method. That means, the scientific value of data is not so clear.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments	I am not able to tell this.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Poor	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Buta Erzsebet
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj – Napoca, Romania