

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_111348
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the Impact of Phosphorus 30C and 200C Potencies on the Growth and Yield of Pisum sativum (Green Pea)
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>It is important but the way it is structured in the results section is confusing because it does not show the different treatments of the P in terms of dilutions.</p> <p>It is suitable but it does not show the Homeopathy as it appears in the text yet it was considered in the methodology. The abstract is not comprehensive. It lacks the comparisons of the Phosphorus applications.</p> <p>Not really. Some sections are confused like the literature review it was suppose to be incorporated in the results. It is correct but statistically poor. The results do not show the treatments of the P AND THE MEAN SEPARATION DOES NOT SHOW IT WAS DONE USING WHICH PROCEDURE OF THE ANOVA BE IT LSD, DNMRT, Turkey Test or other methods. It only shows the measurements</p> <p>References are fine but no format followed and they are not in alphabetical order.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English is okay but the flow in the manuscript is not precise.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript has long writing which makes it difficult to understand the objectives at the end because it combines the Homeopathy with Phosphorus applications which do not show the dilution ratios of the P30C and P200C</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Celiphilo Shakes Mavuso
Department, University & Country	University of Eswatini, Eswatini