

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_112054
Title of the Manuscript:	“A Review on Nano Chitosan and Bio capsules on Growth Yield and Quality of Strawberry”
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Scientific Evaluation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Research Scope and Relevance: The manuscript effectively introduces the relevance of nano chitosan and bio capsules in the context of strawberry growth. The focus on sustainable agriculture is timely and significant. 2. Literature Review: The review of existing literature, including references to previous studies, is comprehensive, providing a solid background for the study. 3. Methodology Clarity: However, the methodology section could benefit from more detailed descriptions of the experimental design and procedures to enhance reproducibility and clarity. 4. Data Analysis: The results and their analysis are pertinent but could be strengthened with more detailed statistical analysis to support the conclusions drawn. 5. Conclusions: The conclusions are appropriate but could be more impactful if directly linked to the specific findings and their implications for future research and practical applications. <p>6. The manuscript effectively introduces the relevance of nano chitosan and bio capsules in the context of strawberry growth. The focus on sustainable agriculture is timely and significant. The review of existing literature, including references to previous studies, is comprehensive, providing a solid background for the study. However, the methodology section could benefit from more detailed descriptions of the experimental design and procedures to enhance reproducibility and clarity. The results and their analysis are pertinent but could be strengthened with more detailed statistical analysis to support the conclusions drawn. The conclusions are appropriate but could be more impactful if directly linked to the specific findings and their implications for future research and practical applications.</p> <p>Linguistic Evaluation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Structure: The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections. Some sentences, however, are complex and could be simplified for better readability. 2. Grammar and Syntax: There are minor grammatical errors throughout the manuscript. A thorough proofreading is recommended to correct these issues. 3. Technical Language: The use of technical terms is appropriate for the subject matter. However, a glossary of terms could be helpful for readers not familiar with some of the specialized vocabulary. 4. Consistency: Ensure consistency in the use of terminology, particularly when referring to scientific concepts and measurements. 5. The manuscript uses appropriate technical terms; however, simplifying some of the more complex jargon could make the paper more accessible to a wider audience. Consistency and Flow: The flow of information is generally good, but there are some abrupt transitions between sections. Smoother transitions would improve readability. Grammar and Syntax: Minor grammatical and syntactical errors are present, which can be corrected through careful proofreading. The manuscript follows a standard academic format, but there are a few inconsistencies in the formatting of 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>references and headings that should be standardized.</p> <p>Recommendations for Improvement: Enhance Statistical Analysis: Providing more comprehensive statistical data would substantiate the findings and give more weight to the conclusions. Simplify Language: Aim for shorter, more concise sentences to enhance the manuscript's readability. Consistent Terminology: Use scientific terms consistently throughout the manuscript to avoid confusion. Proofread for Grammar and Syntax: A detailed proofreading pass would improve the overall quality of the manuscript.</p> <p>Overall Impression: The manuscript presents valuable research with significant implications for the field of agricultural science. Its focus on sustainable cultivation methods is particularly commendable. With improvements in statistical analysis, language clarity, and consistency, this manuscript has the potential to make a substantial contribution to its field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abdullah Jabbar Jaseim
Department, University & Country	College of Dentistry, University of Baghdad, Iraq