

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_99428
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of pruning intensity and foliar feeding of NAA on growth, yield and quality attributes of phalsa (<i>Grewia subinaequalis</i> D.C.) cv. Sharbati
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:

(<https://www.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes the this manuscript is important. it helps the researchers in this field and could be a good reference for upcoming papers. 2. The title is very suitable. 3. The abstract is well descriptive, the aim of study is clear. 4. Yes the subsections and structure are appropriate. 5. Yes it is scientifically correct. 6. References are sufficient and most of them are up-to-date.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	the quality of the language is very good.	
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Wael Alaghawani
Department, University & Country	Alshaam University, Syria