

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_122540
Title of the Manuscript:	PHASE TRANSFER CATALYSIS: NEW TECHNOLOGY TO BOOST ORGANIC AGRICULTURE
Type of the Article	Review 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.	The technology discussed in the article has scope in promoting green agriculture. The authors detailed about the technology with enough investigation. It will be helpful, if quantitative analysis added if any.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	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.	Can add any quantitative analysis to support the technique	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Found to be 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.	The authors included the sufficient state-of-the-art information. The benefit of adoption of the technology is also strongly discussed. Still some statistical reports to defend their claim can be helpful.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient. Formatting still to be ensured.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Good Work.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K. Revathi
Department, University & Country	India