

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124578
Title of the Manuscript:	Quantifying the Impact of Nitrogen Concentration Variations on Quality Characteristics of Soilless Cultivated Cherry Tomato
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)
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 provides valuable insights into optimizing nitrogen concentration in hydroponic systems for cherry tomato cultivation, which is crucial for enhancing fruit quality and yield. The systematic approach and the use of multiple nitrogen concentrations make the findings highly relevant for growers and researchers working in controlled environments or soilless systems. I appreciate the detailed analysis of parameters like fruit diameter, weight, and nutrient content, which contribute to a deeper understanding of nitrogen's role in plant development. However, further discussion on the practical applications of these findings in commercial farming could strengthen the manuscript's relevance to a broader audience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Quantifying the impact of nitrogen concentration variations on quality characteristics of soilless cultivated cherry tomato, is informative and clearly reflects the focus of the study. However, it could be made more concise. If the author wants to change the heading the alternate heading can be "Optimizing nitrogen levels for enhancing quality traits in hydroponically grown cherry tomatoes"	
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, the abstract is comprehensive. However, there is like use of technical jargon like equatorial and polar diameter which make the abstract less accessible to a broader audience. Language can be more simplified.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsection are appropriate.	
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 scientifically robust and technically sound through its rigorous experimental design, detailed methodology, comprehensive statistical analysis, and alignment with existing literature. Methods are detailed and supports the reproducibility with appropriate use of statistical tools to analyze	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Simplifying some of the language may help and being consistence through out the text will increase the easeness of reading the paper.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shreejana K C
Department, University & Country	University of Delaware, USA