

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCS_109892</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Productivity of radish fertilized with a mixture of hairy woodrose (<i>Merremia aegyptia</i> L.) and carnauba straw (<i>Copernicia prunifera</i>).</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes. The manuscript is important to the scientific community.</b></p> <p><b>Yes. The title is suitable for the article.</b></p> <p><b>It is comprehensive enough.</b></p> <p><b>Subsections and structure are Ok, though there is a need for rephrasing the statements in section "Result and Discussion".</b></p> <p><b>Yes. I think it is scientifically correct.</b></p> <p><b>No problem with references.</b></p> <p><b>Comments to authors:</b></p> <p>This study comprises the use of spontaneous species present in agricultural areas is of utmost importance for farmers who cultivate in the agroecological system. The comments on the paper are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The abbreviations mentioned in Table 1 under "Cause of variation" are somewhat different. Could you check and correct the same?</li> <li>2. Provide complete details of the ANOVA results by highlighting the critical components such as the coefficient of correlation, p-value, F values, etc. for better understanding.</li> <li>3. Check the months during which the experiment was carried out as in abstract September – December, 2021 is mentioned whereas, in materials and method, subsection "characterization of the experimental area" June -September, 2023 is mentioned. Also check the mentioned unit for Mg.</li> <li>4. Mention the analytical method followed for the analysis of nutrients (pH, Ca, Mg, K, Na, P &amp; Mo).</li> <li>5. Check the mentioned number of days for incorporation prior to planting as two different number of days (30 days and 13 days) are mentioned in different statements.</li> <li>6. In section "Measurement of agronomic characteristics of Radish"             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Write the statement "the crop was harvested" in place of "experiment was harvested" (1<sup>st</sup> line),</li> <li>ii. Replace "performed from a sample of fifteen plants per plot" by "performed with a sample of fifteen plants per plot" (4<sup>th</sup> line),</li> <li>iii. Replace "measuring" with "measured" in 6<sup>th</sup> line of the section.</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. Thoroughly match the data in the text</li> <li>8. The manuscript is poorly written. Thoroughly check the manuscript for typographical, grammatical, and spelling mistakes. e.g., "Figura 1".</li> <li>9. Rephrasing of statements is required in section "Result and Discussion"</li> </ol> <p><b>Comments to Editor:</b></p> <p>Although the study is very interesting and fascinating but manuscript is poorly written and recommended for a major revision.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language can be improved for better understanding of the readers	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, It is a good paper.	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ankita Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Dr. Yashwant Singh Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, India</b>