

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124730
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF VARIETIES AND STANDARDIZATION OF SPACINGS ON GROWTH PARAMETERS IN PALAK (<i>Beta vulgaris</i> var. <i>bengalensis</i> Roxb.) UNDER SUMMER CONDITIONS IN THE CENTRAL TELANGANA ZONE
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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it explores the performance of different varieties and the optimization of plant spacing in Palak (<i>Beta vulgaris</i> var. <i>bengalensis</i>) under summer conditions. The findings are crucial for improving the growth parameters and yield of this leafy vegetable by identifying the ideal plant density and spacing for various varieties. The study's detailed analysis of factors like plant height, leaf area, and leaf number provides practical recommendations for enhancing productivity. I appreciate this manuscript as it offers valuable insights that can guide farmers and horticulturists in optimizing their cultivation practices, contributing to more efficient and sustainable agriculture.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title was appropriate and concise for the subject matter.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract was appropriate and comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>It was appropriate for the manuscript</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its systematic approach, utilizing a Factorial Randomized Block Design to examine the effects of varieties and spacings on growth parameters in palak. The experimental design, involving three varieties and four spacings with three replications, ensures reliable data collection and enhances the validity of the results. Detailed measurement of growth parameters, such as plant height, leaf number, and leaf area index, using precise tools like a leaf area meter, further supports the accuracy of the findings. Additionally, the statistical analysis applied to the data strengthens the credibility of the conclusions, making this study a valuable contribution to understanding optimal growing conditions for palak.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>References in the introduction and discussion parts could be improved. The references are generally sufficient; however, I would recommend checking if there are recent studies on "PERFORMANCE OF VARIETIES AND STANDARDIZATION OF SPACINGS ON GROWTH PARAMETERS IN PALAK (<i>Beta vulgaris</i> var. <i>bengalensis</i> Roxb.) UNDER SUMMER CONDITIONS IN THE CENTRAL TELANGANA ZONE" that could be included, ideally from the last 5-10 years. Ensuring that the manuscript draws on the latest research will enhance its relevance and impact.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Niraj Kumar
Department, University & Country	Junagadh Agricultural University, India