

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124919
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of foliar Humic acid on growth attributes of Jamun (<i>Syzygium cumini</i> (L.) Skeels.) cv. Goma Priyanka
Type of the Article	Research article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research focus on effect of foliar application of humic acid on jamun. Use of humic acid as an organic compound in plant's growth has been in vogue and it can benefit the readers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be change to "Effect of foliar application of humic acid on vegetative growth attributes of Jamun (<i>Syzygium cumini</i> (L.) Skeels.) cv. Goma Priyanka" as the current title is grammatical incorrect and not best suited.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive, however, it contains certain typing mistakes, grammatical errors and repetition of words, which needs to be corrected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Author has mentioned that the experiment was conducted in factorial randomized block design, however, the experiment is in randomized block design. Author also need to mention the number of replications in each treatment and the total number of plant, along with details about planting material. The material section should also disclose the source of procurement of humic acid and how these concentrations were made. These technical flaws should be addressed. Additionally, author should discuss the results year wise or discuss the pooled data. There is no need to discuss both separately.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The paper contains only 11 references, which is very less for supporting the scientific authenticity of the paper. Moreover, the references are not in the correct journal format.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language quality throughout the paper is optimum, except for the abstract portion. Author should revise the abstract thoroughly.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Neha Thakur
Department, University & Country	Dr Y S Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, India