

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_110254</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of the Effect of Different Bio-Stimulants on the Growth, Quality, and Yield of Strawberries in a Sub-Tropical Climatic Region: A Case Study</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I reviewed the manuscript entitled: Assessment of the effect of different bio-stimulants on the growth, quality, and yields of strawberries in a subtropical climatic region: a case of study. The authors introduce the use of different bio-stimulants for strawberries cultivation. There results showed that the treatment with different bio-stimulants affected the growth and yield. However, there is a lack of support and comparison with previous study, which can help for more understanding. Then in general, the manuscript is important for scientific community but need some improvements</li> <li>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable</li> <li>3. The abstract is comprehensive, but at least, some detail of results should be presented (eg: comparison of the data of the yield) for more understanding</li> <li>4. I think the section of the literature review is not needed, the author should use the relevant information from the literature in the introduction part and discussion part. There is some paragraph in the material and methods that should be placed in results section.</li> <li>5. The manuscript needs scientific rigour. It is important to show the clearly the problematics that this study want to respond, why the use of these bio-stimulants is relevant/needed compared to previous study. The originality of the study should be clear and presented in the section of introduction. The methodology for data analysis should be well presented and explained. The results and discussion part should be more supported by references.</li> <li>6. The references should be updated with recent references.</li> <li>7. Other remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put the line numbers in the manuscript is essential to facilitate the revisions and the follow-up of them.</li> <li>- In the introduction part, no need to cite all the region of strawberry cultivation.</li> <li>- The presentation of the area study is better to put in the section materials and methods</li> <li>- In the materials and methods part, it should be corrected that there are 3 bio-stimulant types with é different concentration for each and not 6.</li> <li>- Table 3 and figure 1 present the same information, authors should select one of them in order to avoid redundancy and put it in results section because it is a result.</li> <li>- The figure 2 is not clear, what is the significance of color variation.</li> <li>- The results of ANOVA should be supported by some indicators like p-value,...</li> <li>- In the conclusion part, it is not so clear how the authors suggest the perspective of improving yield average by 175-300q/ha</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes, language quality is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This manuscript is relevant but need more improvement for a scientific paper</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rakotonindrina Hobimiarantsoa</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Antananarivo, Madagascar</b>