

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123521
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of different rapid multiplication methods in black pepper (Piper nigrum L.) cv. Panniyur - 1
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

<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 feedback here)</i>
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript highlights the success of the serpentine method this is an outstanding result in that it will guide future researchers on how to design their experiments. 2. Plant studies are an evolving aspect in biotechnology and are worth exploring further as did the authors. 3. Black pepper being a cardinal species of India makes this research scientifically important to assist the community be knowledgeable about such a vital crop. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is suitable	
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.	I suggest deletion of the first paragraph that includes the experimental site, that is well noted in the Material and Methods section. If the authors can instead detail the botanical aspects of the Black pepper in their preamble that word be appreciated.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	They are appropriate but could be more detailed, the introduction is not broad enough and there isn't sufficient mention of the materials and methods employed.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is imperative to use several methods in a scientific study, and this manuscript had seven 2. Replicating the treatments four times is very commendable and a correct practice. 3. Conducting the experiment for a period of one year is technically robust and sound. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references in the introduction are not recent, I suggest the authors look for citations that are not more than five years old. Generally, if this is a research paper, I think thirteen references are not enough, additional ones are required and from reputable journals with DOIs.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is scholarly appropriate.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I do not understand the use of two different in-text citation styles.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Beenzu Siamalube
Department, University & Country	Kenya