

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113885
Title of the Manuscript:	Citrus physiological disorders and their ameliorating control measures: A Review
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Importance for the Scientific Community: The manuscript is of significant importance as it comprehensively addresses the challenges faced in citrus cultivation due to physiological disorders. It also provides insights into various control measures, which can be beneficial for improving fruit quality and yield, thus having practical implications for the agricultural sector.</p> <p>Title Suitability: The title of the article is suitable as it clearly reflects the content and scope of the review, focusing on physiological disorders in citrus and their control measures.</p> <p>Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract provides a succinct overview of the main issues addressed in the manuscript, including the impact of physiological disorders on citrus fruit quality and the suggested control measures, making it comprehensive.</p> <p>Manuscript Structure: The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections that systematically cover various physiological disorders, their causes, and control measures. This structure facilitates easy navigation and understanding of the content.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with detailed descriptions of various physiological disorders, supported by references to existing literature, which lends credibility to the information presented.</p> <p>References: The references are sufficient and cover a range of recent studies, indicating that the manuscript is well-researched. However, the addition of more recent studies, if available, could further strengthen the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language Quality: The language and quality of English used in the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication, with clear and concise expression of ideas.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarification of Terminology: Ensure that all specialized terms and abbreviations are clearly defined when first used, to make the manuscript accessible to a broader audience, including those who may not specialize in citrus cultivation. 2. Methodology Details: If any control measures or methodologies are discussed, ensure that they are described in sufficient detail to allow replication by other researchers. This includes specifying the concentrations of treatments, the duration of experiments, and the conditions under which experiments were conducted. 3. Discussion of Limitations: Include a discussion of the limitations of the current review. Acknowledging the limitations provides a balanced view and sets the stage for future research. 4. Future Research Directions: Suggest areas for future research based on the current findings. This can help to advance the field and encourage other researchers to explore related topics. 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andi Subhan Amir
Department, University & Country	Hasanuddin University, Indonesia