

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123503
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Adenium (Adenium obesum) types to wedge grafting
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	The paper is well-structured and provides a comprehensive overview of the research area. The topic chosen has scientific potential and will be useful to many researchers as the baseline data for further research on the species. The paper is written clear and concise. the study is well needed. This paper has a potential to be accepted with minor changes	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable and conveying the work done by the author.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is written nicely and well structured. Author clearly mentioned what is done, how they have done and what results they got. Only one minor suggestion, author has mentioned the best performing treatment but did not mention the least performing one.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	This is an interesting and useful study and I think that the data and results presented are informative. The manuscript is scientifically and technically correct. The species selected has commercial potential.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent but are not sufficient. In Introduction part, most of the statements are not supported by the proper references. Year of publication is missing in some references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is fine	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More references should be added to support the text specifically in the introduction part.</li> <li>• In methodology, the treatments if possible should be given in table format.</li> <li>• Error bar is not shown in Fig 1, to be check.</li> <li>• In result and discussion section, the results are supported by the study conducted in fruit crop, if the author could support the results with some floriculture species it would be more specific and suitable.</li> <li>• In the results, paragraph 1<sup>st</sup> fifth line average number of days to be checked with table 1 values.</li> <li>• Conclusion needs to be elaborated, it is ending abruptly.</li> </ul>	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mhaiskar Priya Rajendra</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SKLTSHU, India</b>