

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 manuscript highlights the importance of phase transfer catalysis and its historical developments. This will help researchers to understand the research direction in this area. However, the authors did not state the review objectives that will guide his review process, which made the article seem like they are just telling the story of phase transfer catalysis technology in India	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript 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 abstract contains a lot of floating sentences, which makes it difficult to comprehend. I recommend the abstract to be rewritten with a logical flow.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are ok but there is no introductory section in the manuscript. Also, it will be appropriate if the methodology section is added to the manuscript. This will indicate the type and source of the journal used in the review	
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 manuscript is technically sound but not scientifically robust. It lacks robustness because there was no clear objectives and there reference are not comprehensive. All the tables in the manuscripts had no references. The sub-section like Golden Gift for Green Harvest and Out of the Box Solution are not scientifically appropriate	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references are not sufficient, and the authors cited unpublished articles and personal observation, without link to the paper.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is sufficient enough however the quality can be improved to make it more robust	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Nwali Osmond Ikechukwu
Department, University & Country	University of Ibadan, Nigeria