

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_122844</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of Organic Growth Promoters on Quality of Pea (Pisum sativum L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores the impact of using organic growth stimulants on the quality and productivity of peas, a topic of significant relevance in the context of sustainable and organic agriculture. The study provides empirical data that can be useful in developing safer and more effective agricultural practices, reducing reliance on harmful chemical fertilizers. While the manuscript presents valuable information, overall, this study can serve as a foundation for further research in this important field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is appropriate because it clearly reflects the content of the study and its purpose, as it specifies the type of stimulants used (organic) and the crop being studied (peas).	
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>The abstract of the article provides an overview of the experiment and the main findings, but it could be improved to be more comprehensive and precise. Here are some suggestions for enhancing the abstract:</p> <p><b>Suggestions to Improve the Abstract:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Add Background Information:</b> The abstract should start with a brief explanation of the research problem, such as the growing interest in organic farming and the search for alternatives to chemical fertilizers.</li> <li><b>Detail the Experimental Design:</b> Include a sentence that briefly explains the experimental design, such as "The experiment was conducted using a randomized block design with three replications for each treatment."</li> <li><b>Clarify Statistical Data:</b> Provide more clarity on the statistical results obtained, such as "The results showed that the application of Vermiwash at 10% increased crude protein content by X% compared to the control."</li> <li><b>Highlight Practical Applications:</b> Add a sentence about how the study's results can be practically applied in agriculture to improve crop quality and yield sustainably.</li> </ol>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>The subheadings and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate for a scientific research article. The manuscript follows the traditional format of scientific papers, including major sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusions. However, some improvements can be made to clarify the content and enhance the scientific value. Here are some suggestions:</p> <p><b>Suggestions to Improve Structure and Subheadings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Add a "Future Studies" or "Recommendations" Section:</b> Adding a section that outlines recommendations for future studies or practical applications of the findings could enhance the importance of the research and provide guidance for other researchers.</li> <li><b>Provide More Details in the "Materials and Methods" Section:</b> The "Materials and Methods" section should contain enough detail to allow other researchers to replicate the study. It would be beneficial to include a more detailed description of the experimental design and procedures used.</li> </ol>	
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 appears scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a randomized experimental design with multiple replications, enhancing the accuracy and reliability of the results. The results demonstrate a clear effect of organic stimulants on the quality and growth of peas. Various parameters such as chlorophyll content, crude protein, and ascorbic acid were measured, providing a comprehensive assessment of the impact of these treatments.	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relatively up-to-date, but they could be strengthened by adding additional references related to the sustainable use of organic stimulants in agriculture, their impact on improving crop quality, and reducing reliance on chemical fertilizers. It is advisable to include references related to modern agricultural technologies and the environmental impact of organic stimulants to enhance the theoretical background of the study</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English in the article is suitable for scientific communication, but there are some linguistic and formatting errors that may need minor revisions to improve clarity and flow.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Ibrahim Talal Hafez</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Damascus University, Syria</b></p>