

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_93224
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of orientation and distance of moringa tree on growth and yield of cabbage
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	I would like to commend the author(s) for the good work so far done especially with regard to the amount of data provided. I particularly like Figures 2-6 :). However, more effort is needed to make the work clearer . The author(s) should be advised to revise the manuscript extensively and improve the quality of writing. Several sentences and paragraphs are poorly constructed and need serious attention. For instance, there is a problem with sentences involving "significant" and "significantly" especially in the results section. Perhaps asking senior colleagues to read and polish the work would help? Specific suggestions: I suggest the title be revised to "Effect of direction and distance of Moringa oleifera on growth and yield of cabbage (Brassica oleracea)". The scientific names should be in italics. I also suggest the word "orientation" be replaced with "direction" throughout the manuscript as it's meaning is clearer (and easier for many readers). In addition, the directions East and West should be correctly placed in Fig. 1. The correct order is N, E, S, W (but not N, W, S, E as shown in Fig. 1).	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fredrick Ssali
Department, University & Country	Norwegian University of Life Science, Norway