

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119112
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on berry thinning and leaf removal practices in grapes
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript serves important in terms of fine grapes for food production industry.</p> <p>The title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract clearly comprehends work done by the author for thinning and leaf removal</p> <p>The section doesn't have subsection but the structure is well composed.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>No the reference is not sufficient and recent. There are plenty of recent researches in crossref and pubmed. The author can refer them</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is the smallest part of research work. It seems like salami slicing. 2. The research work is insufficient for an article 3. There is no work related to yield produced in the experimental vines and how it is efficient with unclipped and non leaf removal berries produced from the vines. 4. A single table with no footnote, abbreviations is given in result. 5. The supportive documents are insufficient to defend the manuscript. 6. In introduction the abbreviations do not have expanded forms 7. The conclusion has no space for future scope and community benefit.</p>	

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)
<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:

Name:	Jahirhussain G
Department, University & Country	Bharathidasan University, India