

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113608
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of plant growth regulators on nutrient and quality changes in Zingiber officinale Rosc
Type of the Article	Original Research 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. Yes, this manuscript is very important for the scientific community. This paper explains the benefits of ginger, one of which is as an antioxidant, but its production still does not meet market demand. So with the research aimed at increasing the production of ginger with higher quality using the method of using four growth regulators on the growth of ginger, it is very good to do.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract needs to be modified. The abstract should be concise by providing the problem, objectives, methodology, and main results consistent with the objectives and conclusions. The abstract in the manuscript is still too general, and too many results are discussed. The abstract shown is more suitable as a conclusion to the results.</p> <p>4. Subsections and writing structure in the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references used are mostly old references, so new references need to be added</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The article in this research is interesting, but some improvements are needed.</p> <p>2. The introduction is too general, there is no specific explanation of similar previous research and the weaknesses of previous research.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Devi Indrasari Mustopa Putri
Department, University & Country	Indonesia