

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_95013
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and productivity of Cauliflower in Aonla based Multistoried Agroforestry System
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.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is. 2. No. Need to be added the soil type and other parameters observed as stated in the methodology should be described briefly in the Abstract. 3. Yes, it is appropriate but it will be better if one section added covering the effect of the treatments on soil characteristics at the end of the trial. 4. The scientific aspect of the manuscript is a little bit weak. 5. Needs more recent journal articles and less unpublished references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	The English is good but still there are some typological errors.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is a more applied research results so that the scientific discussion is somewhat limited.	

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:	Didiek Hadjar Goenadi
Department, University & Country	Indonesian Oil Palm Research Institute, Indonesia