

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120421
Title of the Manuscript:	STUDIES ON CHARACTER ASSOCIATION FOR of andrographolide with GROWTH, YIELD AND QUALITY COMPONENTS IN KALMEGH (Andrographis paniculata Nees.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**Jack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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</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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research is important which allows the breeder to choose particular variety of Kalmegh that grows healthy with high yield. 2. The research is done in a scientific manner, with control and variants, and replicates. 3. Statistical analysis is carried. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, but must high light the aim of the study. So it is modified.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is precise and clear. However, there are 1 or two English grammar mistakes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, appropriate.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The research explored the correlation of andrographolide with the Kalmegh plant growth, yield and quality characters. 2. The experiments has different conditions with a control, and done in 3 replicates, so the research is scientifically valid. 3. Statistical analysis is carried to draw conclusion, so technically valid. 4. In discussion relevant literature must be discussed in detail; and ethe authors should explain how their work differs/like contemporary work. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Yes, References are adequate, which were up to 2020.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are Grammar mistakes, which are corrected.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mistake- andrographolide had negative correlation with dry matter accumulation and not with plant height. 2. 	

Review Form 3

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>	No

Reviewer Details:

Name:	T.V. Rajya Lakshmi
Department, University & Country	Marey Academy, Canada