

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_121058
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of plant growth regulators on growth, yield and fruit quality of strawberry (<i>Fragaria × ananassa</i> Duch.) Cultivar Winter Dawn under polyhouse (Natural Ventilated Polyhouse)
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly in the field of horticulture and agricultural sciences. It provides valuable insights into the effects of plant growth regulators (PGRs) on the growth, yield, and quality of strawberries, a high-value crop. The findings, especially the efficacy of NAA at 125 ppm (T10), offer practical recommendations for improving strawberry cultivation under polyhouse conditions, which can be beneficial for farmers aiming to enhance productivity and economic returns. I appreciate this manuscript for its thorough experimental design and clear presentation of results, which make it a useful reference for both researchers and practitioners in the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>This title is quite descriptive but can be refined for clarity and brevity. A more concise and clear alternative title could be: "Impact of Plant Growth Regulators on Strawberry Yield and Quality in Polyhouse Conditions" This alternative title maintains the core focus of the study while being more succinct and easier to read.</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Suggested Revision: The study titled "Effect of Plant Growth Regulators on Growth, Yield, and Fruit Quality of Strawberry (Fragaria x ananassa Duch.) Cultivar Winter Dawn under Polyhouse Conditions" was conducted at the Department of Horticulture, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, during the 2022-2024 growing seasons. The experiment followed a randomized block design with ten treatments, including a control, each replicated three times. Results indicated that the application of NAA at 125 ppm (T10) significantly enhanced vegetative growth, flowering, fruiting, yield, and fruit quality of strawberries. This treatment is recommended for optimizing strawberry production in polyhouse conditions.</p> <p>Points for Addition: Objectives: Clearly state the primary objectives of the study. Methodology: Briefly mention the type of polyhouse (e.g., naturally ventilated) and the main parameters measured (e.g., plant height, number of leaves, fruit yield). Key Findings: Include more specific data or percentages to highlight the effectiveness of the best treatment. Conclusions and Recommendations: Summarize the practical implications of the findings for growers.</p> <p>Points for Deletion: Institutional Details: Detailed location information can be condensed. Excessive Repetition: Avoid redundant phrases to keep the abstract concise. By incorporating these suggestions, the abstract will be more informative and appealing to the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and covers all necessary components of a scientific study effectively</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound for several reasons. First, it follows a structured approach with clear sections dedicated to Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion. This organization allows for a logical flow of information, making it easy to understand the research objectives, methodology, results, and implications. Second, the experimental design is well-detailed, ensuring reproducibility and reliability of the findings. The use of randomized block design and multiple treatments with replications strengthens the validity of the results. Lastly, the data is presented in a comprehensive manner, with statistical</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>analyses supporting the conclusions drawn. This demonstrates a thorough and careful approach to the research, enhancing the credibility and scientific correctness of the study</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The manuscript's references are relatively sufficient and recent, with some dating as far back as the 1980s and others as recent as 2023. The balance of older foundational studies and newer research is good; however, there might be some gaps that could be filled with additional contemporary sources to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest developments in the field.</p> <p>Here are a few suggestions for additional references:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent studies on the effects of plant growth regulators on strawberry yield and quality from journals like the "Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology" or "Scientia Horticulturae." 2. Reviews on the advancements in strawberry cultivation techniques published in the last five years. 3. Research on the impact of polyhouse environments on strawberry growth and productivity, which might provide deeper insights into the context of your study. <p>Including these types of recent and relevant references will enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance to current scientific discourse</p> <p>Please. It is also noted that References not arranged as per format of journal, which is essentially required</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please add one line conclusion at the end of Abstract 2. The introduction part need to well structured, more reference should be added in this section. 3. Material and methods part is too short and having lack of structure, kindly elaborate the methodology. 4. The result and discussion is not written with the reason and proper justification of the result and discussion parts are extremely poor, the results part is needed to be statistically sound. 5. Numbering of table should be provided and prepare the title of table 6. At every page comments and suggestion has been added for update, please incorporate 7. Results need more explanation along with elaborative discussion with interlinkage of parameters. Not sufficient in discussion and also, not recent. 8. Conclusion part is poor. 9. Add recommendation based on your finding, after conclusion 10. Add future Scope of your study after recommendation 11. None of the references are according to format of the journal, and also it is not incorporated in the text anywhere. 12. Most of the references are not mentioned in the text but it is added at the end of reference. Please add that one. 13. Review has been done in track change method also, and comments added in box for incorporation. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article needs some improvement for scholarly communication. While the manuscript's structure and scientific content are solid, there are grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that can hinder readability and comprehension. For example, sentences often lack proper punctuation, and some terms are inconsistently used. Enhancing the language quality will ensure the manuscript meets the standards expected in scholarly communications, making it more accessible and understandable to a broader scientific audience. Proofreading by a native English speaker or a professional editor would be beneficial.	
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:	Ajeet Kumar
Department, University & Country	Sugarcane Research Institute, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, India