

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_127172
Title of the Manuscript:	Irrigation Management for Garlic Cultivars for Higher Yield and Water Productivity under Zero Tillage Condition
Type of the Article	

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.	The research work is relevant to the current agriculture scenario regarding garlic cultivation in Bangladesh and to the scientific community for better understanding and further research	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NO, the authors did not present any results regarding water productivity in the entire article, I suggest modifying the article title by removing 'water productivity' from it	
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.	No significance or context of the research is mentioned. Also did not mention key highlights of the work. Modify the abstract concisely with all the necessary information. A few corrections are suggested as comments in the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	A few subsections are not 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientifically sound research work, but the overall manuscript is not well documented. The methodology section is not clear and missing some details to make the readers understand the research work clearly. Author(s) did not mention the CD & SEM values in the data tables. The discussion part could have been better. The conclusion is very poor, should highlight the research findings and give a proper recommendation to the farmers or the readers. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	okay	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is very poor. There are grammatical errors also.	
Optional/General comments	1) The abstract is poorly written. 2) The methodology is not explained in detail. 3) The discussion section is very poor and not written properly. 4) The conclusion section is poorly written. 5) The English language is very poor and there are grammatical errors.	

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:	Pittala Manoj Kumar
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture, Kerala Agricultural University, India