

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_124064
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Amaranthus (Amaranthus spp.) types in different planting systems under shade net condition during kharif season
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.	This manuscript provides useful information on how to improve <i>Amaranthus</i> cultivation using shade nets, which is important for sustainable farming in areas with extreme weather.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Response of <i>Amaranthus</i> (<i>Amaranthus</i> spp.) types in different planting systems under shade net condition during kharif season," is somewhat long. alternative title: "Growth and Yield of <i>Amaranthus</i> Varieties in Different Planting Systems under Shade Nets during the Kharif Season" this title focus growth and yield of amaranthus varieties in shade net and planting systems.	
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.	Instead of listing a lot of numbers, point out the most important findings, like which variety performed the best and why it's important. And add which varieties and planting methods can help increase yields for farmers using shade nets."	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	1. The introduction could be more concise. Also, include a clear statement of the research problem or gap that this study is addressing towards the end of the section.	
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 manuscript is scientifically sound because it uses a proven method (Factorial Randomized Block Design) to test how different plant types and planting systems affect growth. The statistical analysis is done correctly, helping to show real differences between treatments. The study also collects detailed data on important factors like plant growth and yield, which makes the results reliable. The research is backed by other studies, which adds to its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are generally relevant but many of them are quite outdated. Some references like "Anonymous (1992)" and "Kelly and Martin (1983)" could be replaced or supplemented with newer research.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>a thorough revision for language clarity and grammar is recommended before publication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In materials and methods, In tables, Make sure the tables have clear titles and explain any short forms (abbreviations). Use the same number of decimal places for all numbers in the tables and keep the formatting consistent. For table significance(p=0.05) used or not ? only significance is mentioned not a p value. In the conclusion, it says that Konkan Durangi has more ascorbic acid and anthocyanin than other *Amaranthus* types, but there is no mention of this in the methods or tables. Were these measured in the study? If yes, can you explain how they were measured and show the results?" In someplaces, cited year is not mentioned. The sentence " 1. In amaranthus types Konkan Durangi (V1) recorded minimum days required for germination were (3.12)" instead use "Among the <i>Amaranthus</i> types, Konkan Durangi (V1) required the fewest days for germination (3.12 days)'. 2. "The leaves and stems of Amaranthus is good sources of essential nutrients..." leaves and stems are plural so the verb should be "are" instead of "is". 3. Raised beds observed the minimum days required for germination." The phrase "raised beds observed" is incorrect, as beds cannot "observe" something. The revised sentence makes the meaning clear. For this, "The raised beds had the fewest days required for germination." 4. Repetitive phrasing "Among the different types of planting beds, raised beds recorded better performance in all parameters (growth, yield, and quality) during kharif seasons." Correction: "Raised beds outperformed other planting systems in all measured parameters (growth, yield, and quality) during the kharif season." <input type="checkbox"/> Simplify long sentences: Break complex sentences into two or more shorter ones. <input type="checkbox"/> Check for missing articles: Use "the," "a," and "an" where needed for clarity. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure subject-verb agreement: Make sure plural subjects have plural verbs. <input type="checkbox"/> Use formal and consistent terminology: Avoid informal phrases or unclear expressions and maintain consistency in the terms used throughout the text.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>J Sankar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Don Bosco College of Agriculture, India</p>