

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_101831
Title of the Manuscript:	THE GROWTH OF BREADFRUIT (<i>Artocarpus altilis</i> Forst) ROOT CUTTINGS ON VARIOUS MEDIA OF ORGANIC MATTER AND CONCENTRATIONS OF 2,4 DICHLOROPHENOXY ACETIC ACID
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.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJHR/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> <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, but rather too long.</p> <p>No. the researcher should consider including a concise conclusion based on the main findings</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Methodology is rather strong.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Attend to all typographical errors as indicated in the manuscript Include a paragraph under introduction as guided in the text 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>ABSTRACT - GOOD AND TIMELY.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION – GOOD BUT LACKS FOCUS SHOWING THE PROBLEM AND AIM</p> <p>WHY IS THE PROBLEM AND OBJECTIVES HIDDEN MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO ASCERTAIN THE DIRECTION OF THE STUDY?</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS – THIS SECTION IS SATISFACTORY.</p> <p>RESULTS – well tabulated as treatment and</p> <p>REFERENCES – Sufficient and recent.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalapula Shepande
Department, University & Country	Rusangu University, Zambia