

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_98239
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Different Levels of Nitrogen on Growth and Yield of Cauliflower (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>botrytis</i>) Varieties
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/AJAHR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>The current study is establishing the research idea of nutritional importance and significance during the development and life span. So the information discussed in the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is, but little modification can be done with respect to the specific result.</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Minor corrections required in the presentation of results.</p> <p>OK</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is ok	
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:	Majesh Tomson
Department, University & Country	CHRIST University, India