

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128517
Title of the Manuscript:	Refining Harvest Timing and Physiological Maturity for Optimal Seed Yield in <i>Stylosanthes hamata</i>
Type of the Article	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: 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>
<b>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.</b>	The study conducted by authors Refining Harvest Timing and Physiological Maturity for Optimal Seed Yield in <i>Stylosanthes hamata</i> . Overall, the study is well-planned and written. However, I am recommending an extensive revision before it can be considered for publication.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Title is correct	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is too long the author need to revise the whole abstract make it to 250 to 300 words.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	yes	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Author needs to add recent references	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Manuscript needs extensive revision. A lot of grammatical and typo mistakes are present in the manuscript. Authors are advised to focus on English language and ask for help from English Native speaker to improve the manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abstract should not be divided into different sections The abstract seems like a general discussion about the study the authors should justify it in a quantitative way</li> <li>2. Results should be extensively reviewed.</li> <li>3. I would like to suggest authors improve discussion with new references and proper justification</li> </ol>	

#### 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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmad Zada
Department, University & Country	Yangzhou University, China