

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119162
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of micronutrients and GA3 foliar feeding on yield attributes of Ber (Ziziphus mauritiana Lamk.) fruit cv. Banarasi Karaka
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><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. Yes, this article is experimental research related to the growth and yield of Ber Fruit plants (cv. Banarasi Karaka) which can be used as a basis for practical decisions and further research in the fields of agronomy and horticulture.</p> <p>2. Yes, The title clearly describes the research subject and provides an overview of the objectives that will be discussed in the article.</p> <p>3. Yes, the article abstract is comprehensive .</p> <p>4. Yes, The manuscript presented has used subsections and structures that are appropriate for writing scientific manuscripts and is quite coherent and informative.</p> <p>5. Yes, The manuscript is scientifically correct, as it adheres to the experimental design, data collection methods, and statistical analysis appropriate for the study</p> <p>6. Yes, The references provided are sufficient and mostly recent, covering relevant studies up to recent years</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION comments</b></p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the quality of the language and English of this article is suitable for scientific communication. The writing is clear, concise and informative</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General comments</b></p>	<p>See the attachment</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Umul Aiman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta, Indonesia</b>