

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 (Brassica oleracea var. botrytis)
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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important to the scientific community in terms of the field of sustainability and the use of industrial residues to preserve the environment and reduce the use of chemical fertilizers, and therefore it will be a good scientific source after the manuscript is modification and acceptance.</p> <p>2. (Effect of indigenous potash sources on quality of cauliflower) was mentioned in the title, but the quality was not mentioned in the manuscript, So I suggest: - Raising the word (quality) from the title. Or - Clarification of how the quality of cauliflower was affected in the results and discussion section.</p> <p>3. Article abstract is acceptable.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is acceptable. 5. Need some modifications to accept it scientifically. 6. Sources are insufficient, at least three sources must be added to the manuscript and be recent from recent years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The language of the manuscript is scientifically acceptable	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Adding a table of some physical and chemical properties of the soil of the study area within the materials and methods section.</p> <p>2. The best results were within T4 treatment as well as nitrogen uptake as reported in the manuscript, the manuscript needs clarification: - The relationship of potassium with nitrogen, especially that the radii are close between nitrogen and ammonium, which makes them compete for fixation sites in clay minerals. - How does nitrogen affect the increase in production</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:	Firas K. Aljanabi
Department, University & Country	Iraq