

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_124441
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of foliar application of micronutrients on bio-chemical attributes of guava (<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.) cv. Allahabad Safeda
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	This manuscript is highly valuable for the scientific community, particularly those working on crop quality enhancement and post-harvest management in horticulture. It addresses the specific effects of micronutrient application on the biochemical composition of guava, contributing to better fruit quality, which has direct implications for both agronomy and food science. The study's focus on guava, a nutritionally significant fruit, underscores its importance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is ok	
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.	The abstract provides a concise overview of the research, covering key elements such as objectives, methodology, and results. However, it could benefit from the inclusion of specific quantitative results to highlight the significance of the findings. Additionally, a clearer statement of the research gap would strengthen the context, making the abstract more comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured, with clear subsections that follow the scientific method. The introduction, materials and methods, and results are logically organized, making it easy for readers to follow the experimental design and findings.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, with robust data and appropriate methodologies. The use of randomized block design (RBD) and proper statistical analysis strengthens the validity of the findings. The detailed biochemical assessments provide valuable insights into how micronutrients affect guava fruit quality.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes sufficient and relevant references, though adding more recent studies on micronutrient application in tropical fruits could enhance its depth. Overall, the references are adequate.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for scholarly communication. The text is clear, though minor improvements in phrasing could enhance readability.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	N R Rangare
Department, University & Country	Mangalayatan University, India