

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
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	

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 used of humic acids as soil amendments to enhance Jamun ( <i>Syzygium cumini</i> (L.) Skeels) cv. Goma Priyanka production renders the manuscript important though humic acid is not necessarily an organic fertilizer, but their presence in soils increase plant nutrient availability, enhance their uptake, and improve on the overall growing environment. In my mind, the author is addressing not just plant growth attributes and yield but soil improvement for sustainable crop production. Moreso, the data collected, and the analysis made are all fascinating. I would suggest that the author conduct further research on the residual effects of humic acids on soil pH.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The author should revisit the abstract to ensure it captures the different subsections in the manuscript. Besides, the author didn't conclude the abstract so well. He/she should ensure conclusion on the abstract is properly written as a way of stimulating readers' confidence. He/she should expand more on the significant effects rates of foliar humic acid had on plant growth attributes and which rate stands out to be the best performing.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate except that the author ought to do proper numbering beginning with the introduction. He/she chose to-do for others and negated others that which does not reflect neatness.	
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.	The different rates of foliar humic acid used in the study speaks to the scientific correctness of the manuscript. The materials and methods coupled with the collection of data and analysis as well as discussion of the results are technically sound. The author concluded the manuscript on a good note stating "it is evident that the HA <sub>3</sub> (HA 3000ppm) treatment yielded the most substantial improvements across various parameters" thus informing his readers to be keen on the final output which is of interest to all including me.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient but not recent which is key to the output of the manuscript. Recent references tend to stimulate readers' attention. It is my wish that the author improves on the references to attract readers to his/her work when published.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is of quality and suitable for scholarly communication. However, the author needs to edit the entire work to avoid the repetition of phrases as seen in the abstract and introduction. This is a scholarly paper and ought to reflect critical thinking. This I think the author isn't short of.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The references i.e., 1994, 1996, 2002, 2009, 2011 etc., are old. The author should review current literature to bring his readers to speed on current happenings. The references should not be more than 10 years older except for an established protocol which is not the case with the references cited by the author. Besides, the author should endeavour to ensure some content is added to the abstract that will reflect the entire manuscript as shown in the different subsections.</p> <p>In the materials and methods, the author should minimize words by carefully letting them out. This is science. The author should try as much as possible to provide references for the methods used in the study that which was not done. Except for other reasons, but this is an establish scientific research protocol that all are to follow in scientific research such as this.</p> <p>I didn't observe any form of plagiarism in the manuscript. The work is original. There are no competing issues in this manuscript. There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>William S. Kolle</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Liberia, Liberia</b></p>