

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_102524
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield Performance of Three Sulawesi Local Aromatic Upland Rice Varieties at Various Planting Distances with Alley Cropping 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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/editorial-policy>)

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>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>	<p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? It is very important to the scientific world as well as farming communities because due to scarcity of rains and paddies high yielding upland rice would be ideal</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? The title of the article is suitable though slightly changed</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract of the article is comprehensive but should consider adhering to the suggestions made</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? The manuscript is scientifically correct because of its nature and references cited and listed, but the views of the author are not well coming out. The author needs to include the missing statistics in the tables. The tables need to have a row showing the values in the slotted rows.</p> <p>I urge the author(s) to critically check the references since some have been deleted and arranged in alphabetical order.</p> <p>It would be fine to use references within ten years backward</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>his is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring in more of their views than citing other scientists works ▪ Improve on the tables to look scientific 	

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:	Felix Mereka Chipojola
Department, University & Country	Malawi