

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	Scientific Research

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>
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 author managed to identify the global importance of the study plant, particularly in Asia (India) for consumption as food and a herbal plant, its commercial value as spice. The author managed to also identify the study gap and how conducting the research will help improving the cultivation of Funugreek as economic viable plant. SEE ATTACHMENT	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, minor suggestions made on the document.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Providing numbering to the subsections in the document will make the work more easier to read or follow.	
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 paper is scientific sound, scientific writing has been demstrate in the paper. The author managed to identify the importance of conducting the research (study gap) and justification thereof (in terms of how conducting the research will help improving the cultivation of Funugreek as economic viable plant).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, minor suggestions we made on the document.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This kind of research is important, it makes a huge contribution to knowledge on the knowledge gap that exist (as it will helps to improve the cultivation/production of such economically valuable crops). More suggestions on how the quality of this paper can be improve have been made on the document.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thobile Mkhwanazi
Department, University & Country	University of Mpumalanga, South Africa