

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_120531
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Organic Manure and NPK Consortium on Growth, yield and quality of Beetroot (Beta vulgaris L.) in Southern Rajasthan Condition
Type of the Article	RESEARCH ARTICLE

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research carried out is commendable as it investigates the effect of organic manure and NPK Consortium on growth, yield and quality of Beetroot (<i>Beta vulgaris</i> L.) in Southern Rajasthan. As beetroot is a valuable crop cultivated for its nutritional value, the findings of this research can help farmers to expedite the production of beetroot. The findings should be disseminated among farmer community so that they can apply the necessary supplements to increase beetroot yield.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title encompasses the overall scope of this research.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract contains the main points of each section of this article. However the title of the article should not be repeated in the abstract. Abbreviation such as DAS should be written in full before it is subsequently used throughout the article. Letter after a comma should not be capitalised.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are appropriate and the structure is well organised and clear to help readers understand the content of this article.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Abbreviation such as RDF, FYM, SSP and MOP should be mentioned in full when it is used for the first time. Statistical analyses and research design are stated clearly in material and method. (1985) seem to appear out of nowhere. Please check. Total number of plants for each treatment should be mentioned. Measuring tool and formula for calculation are clearly stated. Significance difference of findings for each parameter should be indicated since ANOVA was performed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References used are recent and relevant.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English used is fairly good.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chin Chee Keong
Department, University & Country	Institute of Teacher Education, Malaysia