

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_98232
Title of the Manuscript:	Variation in Morphological Attributes and Soil Characteristics of Potential Horticultural Plants growing in the Wild.
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJHR/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		
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community as it may promote the growing of wild ornamental plants.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract of the article is as much as comprehensive. But there is correction in abstract. It is highlighted by yellow color. Correct it carefully.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. YES, the references are sufficient. Remove the older references and include only past ten year old references. Cross check all the references in text as well as in list of references. References must be as per format of the journal. It should follow the standard style of esteemed Journal. Meticulously examine all references in text which must be properly matched with bibliography.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable is for scholarly communications.	
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:	Suneeta Singh
Department, University & Country	Shri Guru Ram Rai University, India