

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_100250
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of indigenous potash sources on growth, yield and quality of cauliflower (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>botrytis</i>)
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.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/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, this manuscript it is important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title is good according to the article content.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is enough for good presentation of article content.</p> <p>Yes, such subsections and structure of the manuscript are common for research community.</p> <p>I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>The references are more or less efficient and recent (not excellent but enough).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the quality of English in the article is excellent and suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In article there not list of abbreviation (such as RBD, RDF, et cetera). It is very difficult for information perception. I strongly recommend to insert the list of abbreviation in article. After completion the article may be recommend for publication.</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alexander V. Kurovsky
Department, University & Country	National Research Tomsk State University, Russia