

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_97711
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of the Effects of Pre-Sowing Treatments on the Germination and Growth Parameters of <i>Abelmoschus esculenta</i> Linn.
Type of the 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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. The work evaluates the effects of pre-sowing treatments on the germination and growth of <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> , which leads to important recommendations.  2. The title expresses the situation under study.  3. It is necessary to mention the experimental design used.  4. The work presents an adequate structure.  5. It is recommended to specify the effect of the treatments for each of the times evaluated.  6. The references are adjusted to the context of the investigation.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Minor: yes, acceptable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Optional: make a graphical representation to facilitate the interpretation of the results.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Manuel Emilio Milla Pino</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Jaen, Peru</b>