

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125066
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Integrating Plant Growth Regulators and Micronutrients on Growth, Phenology and Seed Yield of Fenugreek (<i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The author has chosen intriguing field research that is necessary to study to improve the physiological quality and quantity of fenugreek. The manuscript requires major revisions in all sections of manuscript.</p> <p>Major revisions are required in Introduction: Introduction section broadly covers general introduction of Fenugreek, a little about treatments have been introduced. Only plant growth regulators have been introduced (little), Mixol not all introduced</p> <p>Strictly major revisions are required in material and methods: Full forms of NAA and GA₃ not mentioned. On what basis the specific concentration of plant growth regulators was selected. Plot area of experimental unit in which fenugreek was planted not mentioned. When these treatments were applied in case of foliar spray? Leaf area, biomass, physiological and biochemical observations mentioned in methods but no data related to this provided in manuscript. This shows that vague parameters have been mentioned in the manuscript. Observation time interval not mentioned. Formula used for calculating harvesting index not mentioned</p> <p>Revisions are required in results and discussions: Authors have not mentioned Table and Figure number in body of results. Results should be discussed with recent references.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, it is suitable Authors should check whether it is really important to add "integrating" word in title. According to me this word should not be added.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract is comprehensive. Major portion of abstract is covered with nine treatments A line- "Data were collected on different growth and yield characters of fenugreek"- stages should also be mentioned.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections of results and discussions are appropriate. The structure of manuscript needs to be revised especially of material and methods different subsections like Experimental area, treatments detail (which should include solvent used to prepare concentrations, Composition of Mixol, treatment application time etc.)</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Scientifically in accordance with the plant growth and seed yield parameters provided is correct. Technically authors have not provided any information on basis of which it can be checked e.g. they have not mentioned in which solvent the concentration of plant growth regulators was prepared.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-</p>	<p>There are no recent references especially after 2020. A single reference of 2020 has been reported in manuscript by the authors. References inside the manuscript should follow one way e.g. Sharma et al., 2016 or Sharma et al. 2016 References style not correct, it should be according to journal guidelines of reference setting</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English needs to be improved scientifically.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, grammatically and English need to be checked e.g. biological yield: First line doesn't make any sense A major revision is needed	

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:	Aayushi Singla
Department, University & Country	Punjab Agricultural University, India