

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRCS_109198   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | EFFECT OF <b>SOWING DENSITY</b> AND SOWING METHOD ON SEED YIELD OF FENNEL |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

### 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</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the theme of the manuscript is important because fennel is used in the natural treatment of many diseases, but the content must be perfected so that it can be scientifically accepted.</li> <li>I think the title is appropriate, but the English translation needs to be revised.</li> <li>The summary of the article is not complete, it doesn't describe the subject, the general objective and the conclusion are not clear, the summary needs to be revised</li> <li>I think the sub-sections and the structure are appropriate, but the results and the discussion could be split up.</li> <li>The document is not scientifically correct must revise the comments to improve the scientific quality of the document</li> <li>the references are insufficient, must improve the bibliography to provide enough references</li> </ol> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>   | As far as the quality of English is concerned, I think it's British English that's most appreciated, so they need to review the quality of English.  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | In general, it should explain the problem and specify the main objective. I think the introduction is poor on the whole, you could improve it better through the bibliography review. Also the discussion is poor, he has not discussed his results enough and compared them with the results of other researchers in this field. As for the conclusion, it needs to be revised  |   |

### 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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Sawadogo Raogo Bernard</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>University at Norbert Zongo, Burkina Faso</b> |