

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124794
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Physiological Disorders in Tomato: Environmental Triggers, Nutrient Imbalances and Control Strategies
Type of the Article	Review 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.	While the manuscript addresses a pertinent topic, its significance to the scientific community is unclear. The methodology lacks sufficient innovation, merely reiterating established approaches with minimal advancement. Furthermore, the results are not positioned within the broader context of current literature, leaving readers uncertain about its novelty. For it to contribute meaningfully, the authors must emphasize its unique findings and provide stronger justification for its relevance. Currently, the paper feels underdeveloped and fails to articulate its broader implications clearly.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is not suitable as it lacks specificity and fails to reflect the manuscript's unique contribution. A more focused title would enhance its impact.  Suggested alternative: "Enhancing Data Classification in IoT Systems: A Comparative Algorithm Study"	
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 abstract is not comprehensive; it should clearly state the research objectives, briefly describe the methodology, summarize key findings, and highlight implications. Adding these elements will enhance clarity and significance for readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are generally appropriate, but some adjustments could improve clarity and flow. Ensure that each section logically transitions to the next, and consider adding subheadings for complex topics to guide the reader. Additionally, a clearer delineation of methods, results, and discussion would enhance overall readability.	
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 manuscript showcases a strong grasp of scientific principles and methodologies relevant to the research topic.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally adequate and cover a range of relevant studies.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance clarity and improve overall readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript presents a compelling investigation into the subject matter, but it would benefit from a clearer articulation of the research objectives and findings. Strengthening the introduction with more background information would provide better context for readers. Additionally, consider incorporating more recent studies to support your claims and enhance the discussion. Overall, while the study has potential, addressing these aspects will significantly improve its impact and clarity within the scientific community.	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. Bharathi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India</b>