

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_125485
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Graded Levels of Potassium Fertigation on Growth of Jalapeno Pepper Grown in Red Bole Soil Under Polyhouse
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	1-Among the importance of this manuscript: 1.1.Since pepper has a special place among vegetables today due to its high nutritional value, for this reason, this manuscript has addressed it. 1. 2. The pepper plant is sensitive to potassium deficiency, that's why this manuscript deals with it. 2- Why do you like this manuscript? 2.1. I am interested in the pepper plant and its fruit, because it is an economic and nutritional plant. 2.2. Because the pepper plant is sensitive to the lack of soil moisture, therefore, they will require careful management from planting to harvest.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, because the title matches the manuscript text.	
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.	It is not a comprehensive abstract (background to conclusion and suggestion). Since this manuscript of the respected authors pursues a good goal, it needs structural management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript has moderate and acceptable main components and infrastructure.	
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.	1. The manuscript is moderately structured, but serves a good scientific purpose.2. The selected components of the experimental plan are scientific and acceptable in the target area.3. The results and discussion, which constitute one of the main parts of a research, have been shown well by the authors with two components (table and diagram).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Considering the many researches in today's world on the subject of pepper, the authors have not done a good and sufficient job in the introduction and references. Authors should use appropriate and sufficient referencing strategy for the quality and updating of their manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the handwritten language is evaluated at the international level as average. In other words, the authors did not use structured scientific literature in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Authors are suggested, to further value their manuscript internationally: 1- Take seriously the editing and structure of the manuscript. 2- To improve the scientific literature of the manuscript text.3. The conclusion is short and does not have a proper structure.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seyyed Akbar Sadaty
Department, University & Country	Islamic Azad University, Iran