

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_121053
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of NAA and Zinc sulphate on Marketable Yield and Physical Parameters of Litchi (Litchi chinensis Sonn.) cv. Rose Scented
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This study is important for increasing the quality and shelf life of the Litchi and, and it can be used by the scientific community to continue this project or carry out similar projects.	
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.	What does NAE stand for? In the first place where an abbreviation word appears, you must give its full name.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 treatments and statistical method have been chosen correctly, but the significance of the treatments in the tables and figures are not clear. Please use error bars on the graphs, and use different letters on each bar to indicate the significance or non-significance of the data.	
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?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Syedhamidreza Ziaolhagh
Department, University & Country	Iran