

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113726
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant growth regulators on Total chlorophyll content and chlorophyll stability index of banana cv. Ney Poovan
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>The manuscript addresses a relevant aspect of banana cultivation, exploring the impact of nitrogen levels and plant growth regulators on chlorophyll content and stability. Understanding these factors is crucial for optimizing crop productivity. However, the significance could be further emphasized by highlighting potential applications in sustainable agriculture and addressing current challenges in banana cultivation.</p> <p>The title is suitable but could be more specific to attract the attention of readers interested in banana cultivation and crop physiology. A revised title suggestion could be: "Optimizing Banana Crop Productivity: Effects of Nitrogen Levels and Plant Growth Regulators on Chlorophyll Dynamics in Ney Poovan Cultivar."</p> <p>The abstract is informative, covering the objectives, methods, and key results. However, it could be enhanced by providing a brief summary of the findings and potential applications. Adding a sentence on the practical implications of the results would make the abstract more comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsections and structure are generally appropriate, with clear divisions between introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. To improve clarity, consider providing a separate section for "Results" and "Discussion" to enhance the flow of information.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<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>The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, presenting results in a clear manner. However, more details on statistical analyses and variability in the data could enhance the robustness of the study. Additionally, discussing any limitations or uncertainties in the methodology would contribute to scientific transparency.</p> <p>The references include a mix of relevant studies; however, more recent sources could be added to ensure the inclusion of the latest research. Consider incorporating references from the last 5 years to strengthen the literature review and demonstrate awareness of recent advancements in the field. Suggest adding references on recent developments in banana cultivation practices and crop physiology.</p>	
--	---	--

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, with minor areas for improvement in clarity, sentence structure, and consistency in scientific terminology.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-structured and scientifically sound. However, it would benefit from more explicit statistical details, deeper insights into the physiological mechanisms, and the addition of specific values for observed changes. Additionally, a concise conclusion summarizing key findings and their implications would enhance the overall manuscript.	

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:	J. Ebenesar Anna Bagyam
Department, University & Country	Karpagam Academy of Higher Education, India