



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_48020
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Ornamental Potential of Safflower (<i>Carthamus tinctorius</i> L.)
Type of the Article	<u>Original Research Article</u>

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>)

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	Original information and great contribution to the flower market, which is always looking for news. Research problem well defined and paper well discussed.	Thank you very much for your so positive feedback. I was so happy when I read this.
Minor REVISION comments	Material and methods: Describe what characteristics are used to determine the harvest point? Scale of notes for assessment of post-harvest visual appearance? Irrigation? Fertilizing?	The suggestions were well received and I tried to attend them all.
Optional/General comments	It is suggested that sensorial analysis be performed with potential consumers to evaluate acceptance.	This is an incredible suggestion! Now, this is difficult to do, however, in an upcoming article, I will remember to include this.

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)	There aren't ethical issues in this manuscript.