

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_95026
Title of the Manuscript:	INFLUENCE OF ELICITORS AND SEED RATE ON ENHANCING GROWTH AND YIELD OF BLACK CUMIN (<i>Nigella sativa</i>)
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.journalaprij.com/index.php/APRJ/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)	The subject of the study is current and quite relevant. Similar studies should be encouraged. However, I suggest some points that can improve the presentation of the study, they are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The author could expand the bibliographic review on the subject, citing a few more articles that dealt with soil fertility and its influence on crop production.- A map highlighting the location would help to locate where the experiment was carried out, especially for readers from other countries.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	References may be more current. There are many references that are more than five years old.	
Optional/General comments	The article is interesting and contributes significantly to the knowledge of improvement of <i>Nigella sativa</i> in regions with similar characteristics	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Willames de Albuquerque Soares
Department, University & Country	University of Pernambuco, Brasil