

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_96428
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF CHARCOAL AND SEEDING DEPTH ON THE AGRONOMIC PERFORMANCE OF ZUCCHINI (CURCUBITA PEPO) IN KORHOGO
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.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1) Yes. The article is very important for the scientific community, especially for local agriculture. 2) Yes. The title is appropriate. 3) The objective of the study can be written more objectively and clearly. 4) * the introduction can be divided into two or three paragraphs, thus improving reading and comprehension. * the Material and Methods section and the subsections are ok. Only in subsection 2.3 was figure 1 cited first than table 1, and they appeared inverted, that is, table 1 first. * in subsection 3.1, table 3 was not cited in the text. * appeared two subsections 3.2. The second should be 3.3 and 3.3 should be 3.4 and figure 4. 5) yes. 6) yes.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	I suggest reviewing all journal publication rules including references.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Giovanni Guimarães Landa
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário de Caratinga, Brazil