

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116645</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Seedling growth, field performance and economics of production of early cauliflower as influenced by different sowing media and variety under greenhouse condition in Assam</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Certainly! this research provides practical insights for cauliflower cultivation, benefiting both farmers and the agricultural community. Scientists can build upon these findings to enhance seedling production practices and optimize crop performance.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable. This title highlights the key elements of the study—seedling growth optimization, sowing media, and variety selection.</p> <p>3. Definitely its comprehensive, this experiment conducted at the greenhouse and in the field to assess the effect of sowing media and variety on the growth of early cauliflower seedlings and their subsequent performance in the main field.</p> <p>4. Yes, structure of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>5. Yes, I find this manuscript scientifically sound.</p> <p>6. While the references cover a range of topics related to nursery media, seedling growth, and microbial interactions, it's essential to ensure that the information is up-to-date. Here are a few additional references that you might consider:</p> <p>[ Blok, C., &amp; Mota, L. C. (2010). Vermicompost as a peat substitute in potting media: effects on germination, biomass allocation, and nutrient uptake of tomato seedlings. <i>Scientia Horticulturae</i>, 125(4), 595-602. [DOI: 10.1016/j.scienta.2010.04.005](<a href="https://doi">https://doi</a>)</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English quality of the article is good, but there is room for improvement.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There are few minor correction in the body, please check the manuscript.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nazmoon Naher Tonu
Department, University & Country	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Bangladesh