

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_107260
Title of the Manuscript:	The effect of green compost processed organic fertilizer and chlorella microalgae solution on chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b, carotenoid and proline content of Tropaeolum Majus under drought stress
Type of the Article	

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The importance of this manuscript is not clear since it cannot be ascertain on how this study is different from previous studies. The problem statement is also not clear. The reason why <i>Tropaeolum majus</i> plant is used for study is also not mentioned.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>4. No. a. There is no clear headings for MATERIALS AND METHODS. b. The methods followed from previous research should be mentioned. c. The author should restructure the subsections, especially for the methods according to the steps that should be taken first. Some parts can be combined to make them more clearer. d. No mention about the control use e. No mention about the drought condition f. The whole part of methods should be restated g. Restructure/combine the RESULTS AND DISCUSSION section into two main subsections – 1) Chl a, chl b and carotenoids of <i>T. majus</i> after treatment, and, 2) Proline content/concentration of <i>T. majus</i> after treatment – and relate the results with sufficient supports from other previous research h. The discussion is not comprehensive i. Restate the CONCLUSION j. Please recheck your REFERENCES format (for e.g. the font type as well as make sure the scientific name is italicised)</p> <p>5. Scientific argument was there but need to expand to support the study</p> <p>6. References are not sufficient and most of the references are outdated</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	No.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	For more comments, please refer to the reviewed manuscript.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hazlina Ahamad Zakeri
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia, Malaysia