



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_46681
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Mineral Nutrition and Hormone on Plant Growth and Flower Yield of Carnation Cultivars in Khumaltar, Nepal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only mineral nutrition affected the yield, why the plant hormone cannot affect flowering and yield? 2. There is no explanation why you used 40 gr N/m² on this experiment, also the explanation you used 25 and 40 ppm of IAA. 3. In vegetative and floral characteristics, why only Flower stem diameter was affected by plant hormone. Please explain it. 4. Please explain how to measure the variables more detail. 5. The differences on variables were only by cultivars not by mineral nutrition and plant hormone. Please explain it. 6. Please check your title. It was not appropriate with your result. Please considered it. 7. Most of your references were too old (more than 10 years). Please change it with the new one. 8. Discussion not so deep. Please change it. 9. Elaborate your method more precisely and add some information about mineral nutrition such as the N you used from Urea or what else? IAA did you use for pure analysis or other form? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Please revised it before published	

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)	