

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_100395
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of foliar spraying by using some stimulative substances on growth, dry seed yield and its components and some chemical constituents of pea plants (Pisum sativum L.) under high temperature stress conditions
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.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> <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 use of foliar sprays assist to stimulate certain chemical reactions hence increase yield</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 and include the recommendations</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but too long and not appetizing because of the repetition of the references.</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 statistics is not clear. If P=0.05 can 0.1 or 0.2 be significant? The tables need to have a row showing mean values. The yellow highlighted references are not cited yet they are listed. I urge the author(s) to critically check. Reference in red is cited but not listed. 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>This is a important manuscript but the author(s) need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bring in more of their views that citing other scientists works ▪ Delete some of the paragraphs as suggested ▪ Remove out all old references apart from the originals ▪ 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)
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Felix Mereka Chipojola
Department, University & Country	Malawi