

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128204
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Foliar Nutrient Application on Quality Attributes and Leaf Nutrient Composition in Kinnow Mandarin
Type of the Article	Manuscript

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<p>The manuscript is important in indicating the importance of foliar feed in the fruit quality. The author has done good job but fails to clearly bring out the objectives of the study. Did he/she intend to study both fruit and leaf contents... in some statement the author indicates his overall aim is to study only zinc contents (Last statement in the introduction section)</p> <p>"These findings highlight the significance of zinc as a crucial micronutrient in improving the export quality of Kinnow mandarins" indicating that the author is concentrating to study zinc contents.</p> <p>The first statement on methods sections also shows a different intention of the author</p> <p>"The current study, "Influence of foliar application of nutrients on fruit set, yield, and quality of Kinnow Mandarin," . This shows that the intended objectives are not coming out well to the reader and it's confusing</p> <p>How does the author show that the leaf residues from foliar feeds does not influence the results in the analyzed leaf contents?</p> <p>The manuscript is missing conclusion and recommendation which would indicate the overall result finding and offer a solution to fill the existing gap.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>No</p> <p>The title needs to be reconsidered, because the author emphasizes more on Fruit nutrients and quality attributes than that of the leaf. This indicates that the results are for both the fruit and leaf nutrient content.</p> <p>To my opinion, the author should restructure the title to show that the overall goal is improvement of fruit quality upon use of foliar feeds rather than leaf quality.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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 abstract does not clearly indicate leaf nutritional contents after foliar feed, but mainly talks about the fruit, this does not rhyme with the title.</p> <p>Its does not show Why the quality attributes and Nutrient Composition of the Leaf. The author has not shown any emphasis on the importance of the leaf and why its nutrient content is important.</p> <p>Rather empasizes more on fruit nutrients</p> <p>No clear and strong objectives are coming out to the reader</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>Yes, but should be restructured to bring out the objectives of the study and not a mix-up of objectives</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References need to be reviewed and up-to-date. Some are so old dated back to 1992</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is okay but requires a checkup on grammatical errors</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript require a thorough review by the authors</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></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>Dinah Kirigia</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Meru University of Science and Technology, Kenya</p>