

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_98720
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic mulch and mycorrhizal inoculation on growth and yield of tomato plants
Type of the Article	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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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. The manuscript has great importance in scientific field as in the present situation of globalization and health awareness demands horticultural crops has increased worldwide. The increasing demand for the fruits and vegetables and market competition has forced the farmers to produce more and high quality fruits and vegetables for sustaining in the international market. Use of organic mulching is one of the suitable methods which could help the horticultural growers to increase the production with good quality sustainability. 2. Yes, title is satisfactory. 3. Yes abstract is ok. Yes, the structure of the manuscript is satisfactory. 5. No, the manuscript is not scientifically correct. The materials and methods section is not clear. Authors have needed to re-write it to make clarity. Also there are no citations for the methods used. Similarly, Results are also well written. Authors are not even aware how to describe Tables and in which way they write to refer these tables. The discussion is totally absent in this manuscript. Not a single citation has been given to support any one of the results. The results are not discussed at all. Hence manuscript is totally wrong by write-up. 6. No, There should be a great need to add more citations and references in Methology, Discussion sections to strengthened the work authentication.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, English quality is not good. Native language editor is highly recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bilqees Fatima
Department, University & Country	Minhaj University, Pakistan

Review Form 1.7