

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123254
Title of the Manuscript:	LAI, photosynthesis and chlorophyll content influences yield and quality of Nanasaheb Purple Seedless grapes under semi-arid condition
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>It is interesting in the articles to comment on the negative parts obtained from the research (they always exist but are not usually included)... The excessive retention of leaves (>16 leaves above the bunch) negatively impacts these quality parameters, so it is Interesting to continue the research. It is also interesting to carry out new research on organic fertilizers, digestate for example, and see the results. Today there are not many articles related to the improvement of these fertilizers in agricultural production.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</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>The summary is scarce, it is recommended to give more length to the content. It may contain the answer to questions such as: why was the study done? What was done and how? what are the results? What do these findings mean and what impact do they have? The summary can be structured with the sections of: objective, design, environment, subjects, results and conclusions or unstructured, in which information is usually give in two or three paragraphs. It starts well, but then only results are described. They should be described succinctly and continue to give other details of the investigation.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is correct. The titles are correct. Introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.</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>It can be considered a well-formed and structured manuscript, although some errors need to be corrected. It is recommended to also correct the last table, it does not keep the format with the rest of the tables. In addition, they must be unified, either the title is written in all of them after the table or at the beginning, but in all of them the same. It is recommended to post some images that further clarify the study carried out. Well-chosen images give more consistency to the article.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>It is advisable that references are no more than 8-10 years old. Except one or two if its use is extremely important. It is suggested to carry out a bibliographic review of the studies published in the last 10 years and update the references in the text. Some more references could be recommended. Some more references could be added, up to 40. The reference Auzmendi, I., & Holzapfel, B. P. in the text is written 2016 and in the references section 2014, Junges, A. H., Fontana, D. C., & Lampugnani, C. S. in the text is written 2018 and in the references section 2019, they must correct. All references must be named in the article, for example: Martínez de Toda, F., & Balda, P. (2013) is not in the text. Unify references, some the year is in parentheses, others not.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations...- It would be interesting to give some more data in the conclusion, more information about the result obtained. Explain a little more the good results obtained.- As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study	

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:	Noe Anes Garcia
Department, University & Country	University Oviedo, Spain