

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_126237
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Efficacy of Vermiwash Foliar Spray on Yield and Nutrient Dynamics in Okra Cultivation
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	An interesting piece of work on the efficacy of Vermiwash in improving nutrient availability in Okra Vermiwash is an organic fertiliser and its use is a sustainable alternative. Hence work is significant	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Scientifically correct and graphs presented are relevant Work is simple and presented well	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are just sufficient Some more references may be cited in the discussion section to make the work more reliable	
Minor REVISION comments	Language is suitable	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Mujeera Fathima
Department, University & Country	(Government Arts College, University of Madras), India