

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_100844
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Biostimulants for low-cost input solution for onion crop (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) cultivation in four districts of Maharashtra, by providing resistance or tolerance against abiotic and biotic stresses related to global climate change
Type of the 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>)

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Improve English</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The results were very interesting and corroborated with the literature. However, the author (s) left something to be desired in the discussion of the results. They could have explored the discussion better, emphasizing the importance of this study, for example.</p> <p>The work is interesting and compatible at the level of the journal.</p> <p>All information on the work was understandable and consistent with each other.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Renisson Neponuceno de Araujo Filho
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Tocantins, Brazil