

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129583
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF NOVEL PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS AND FRUIT BAGGING ON YIELD AND SHELF LIFE OF GUAVA (<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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.	Your work is very good, but the paper given to me for review contains many silly mistakes. For example, the references are not following a uniform pattern, the table formatting is not up to the mark, the discussion section is lacking depth, and the introduction also needs significant improvement. Once these issues are addressed, the paper will be fine.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	To determine if the title is suitable, it should be: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concise: Clearly convey the core topic of the paper. 2. Informative: Reflect the main findings or focus areas. 3. Relevant: Align with the content and field of study. 	
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.	The abstract should comprehensively summarize the study by clearly stating the objective, methodology, key findings, and conclusion. It should also highlight the recommended treatment and provide a justification for its recommendation. Adding the best treatment and explaining why it is significant will make the abstract more practical and insightful. Ensure the abstract avoids unnecessary details but includes essential information, such as specific data or trends, to provide a clear understanding of the study's contribution. Keywords must be in alphabetically arranged	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The hypothesis or objective should be clearly stated and logically supported by the results. Furthermore, the findings should be consistent with existing literature or provide a valid rationale if they challenge previous studies. The discussion should effectively connect the results to the broader context of the research field, ensuring the conclusions are justified and well-supported. If there are discrepancies in these areas, they should be addressed for the manuscript to meet scientific standards.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript should be sufficient, recent, and relevant to ensure the credibility and scientific rigor of the study. Adequate referencing provides a solid foundation for the research and supports its findings. It is essential to include recent studies, ideally published within the last 5–10 years, to reflect current advancements in the field. Additionally, the references should directly relate to the research topic and offer a balanced mix of foundational studies and recent developments. If the manuscript lacks relevant or updated references, it would benefit from the inclusion of recent literature that aligns with the study's objectives and findings.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language should be clear, concise, and free of errors, maintaining an academic tone. It must ensure smooth readability, precise terminology, and logical structure for effective scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments	Refined the introduction part	

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:	Reetika Sharma
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Sciences & Technology of Jammu, India