

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_112231
Title of the Manuscript:	Gibberellic acid and planting time influence on the growth and yield of cabbage
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>Yes. It has scientific values and also information's generated with regarding to GA3 &amp; planting time which helps producers to use as a package. Moreover, it needs confirmations by doing at least on three different locations for two years</p> <p>Influence of Gibberellic acid and planting time on the growth and yield of cabbage (<i>Brassica oleracea</i> var. <i>capitata</i> L.) in Bangladesh</p> <p>Why you intended to do this research? If you indicate your objectives in the abstract the reader can understand your findings in line with your objectives</p> <p>The references are very few and also too old. Better if you use recent data from FAO stat. Where is the rank of Bangladesh in cabbage production? Indicate your country statics in terms of Cabbage area coverage, yield t/ha and use recent journal articles. The references are not sufficient and not recent.</p>	<p>OKAY</p> <p>OKAY</p> <p>OKAY</p> <p>OKAY</p> <p>OKAY</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<p>The author started all the traits descriptions with same sentences" <b>Combined effect of different concentrations</b>" which is boring for the reader and better to use other ways/styles of writing. Moreover, the detail results and discussion needs compare and contrasts with recently published research results.</p>	<p>NOTED</p> <p>NOTED</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The study is generally importation and has basic research elements but it is shallow. It needs detail information especially in results and discussion part. The writing style is almost similar which is not attractive for readers. The result and discussion part lacks compare and contrasting. Only positive results were described and needs also the other way rounds.</p>	<p>OKAY</p>

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	