

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123689
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Panchgavya and micro-nutrient (Zinc and Boron) on Growth Attributes and Yield of Chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under Irrigated Condition
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

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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of micronutrients and organic compounds are very important for boosting production and quality of chickpea. • The materials and method part were not stated (explained) clearly. • There is no economic analysis 	
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.	The title in the abstract should be removed The objective should be included	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No well organized	
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.	It contributes for development knowledge through publication Share idea and best practise for scientific comunity Additional skill development strategy	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Some references are too old and should be substituted the recent one	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript should be rewritten based on my comment on the article SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Belay Yebo
Department, University & Country	Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia