

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Research Journal of Agriculture |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_ARJA_123956 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Effect of different growing media on shoot growth of dragon fruit cuttings [<i>Hylocereus undatus</i> L. (Haworth) Britton & Rose] |
| Type of the Article | Original Research work |

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory 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. | Presented manuscript gains key interest because of plant- dragon fruit. Dragon fruit is in high demand as its potential of metabolic health enhancer due to probiotic fibres As its cultivation with different soil amendments will be very useful to farmers after significant result output from this research. Flow is perfect, but there is need of English sentence formation and red highlighted numbers indicate what? Numbers in [] square brackets and references are in not accordance. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | Abstract is simple and to the point. But output of presented work needed to highlight properly. As in last statement write in bracket values of each parameter obtained in respective soil treatment. Abstract needed to be revised in terms of incorporation of result value of important parameters. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Subsections are ok. Materials and method needed to bit elaborate in terms of RBD and soil amendments. | |
| 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. | Manuscript is justifying scientific correctness from the given significant difference and standard error table. This manuscript is scientifically robust as each parameter have been covered with reference to shoot growth. But there is need to justify why treatment T7 is showing good result? Justify the effect of coco peat and vermicompost on outcomes is required. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | References are not in any proper style. Alphabetically or numerically not arranged. Needed to increase reference with recent last 3 years. | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | English quality is moderate. There is not as such any grammatical error found. | |
| Optional/General comments | Quite good work is done. Yet minor correction will lead to much strong and scientifically sound manuscript. | |

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: | Pooja C. Desai |
| Department, University & Country | Bhagwan Mahavir University, India |