

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JABB_117837
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of PGR and Micronutrients on Growth, Yield and Quality of Strawberry (<i>Fragaria x ananassa</i>) cv. Winter Dawn
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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>The manuscript is having poor scientific writing, major grammatical mistakes, results and discussion is not properly written.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No not clear and not even read properly before submission. The abstract should infer the gist of your research but in this manuscript, it is lacking and grammatical and spelling mistakes are also there.</p> <p>No in the material method sections list of observations recorded was missing, in result repetitive sentences were used and discussion also not written properly. Data mentioned in the tables are not explained properly in the result section.</p> <p>1. There is a complete mismatch between the references cited in the text and the reference section. It looks like just for the sake of increasing the number the random references are added. 2. The author has used references from 2003,2004, 2009, and 2016 but no recent references from 2020 onwards.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No poor writing with silly grammatical mistakes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Nidhi Dubey
Department, University & Country	Lovely Professional University, India