

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121605
Title of the Manuscript:	Discriminant analysis of plant growth regulators among vegetable growers in Junagadh district of Gujarat
Type of the 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)
<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>The manuscript was very vital for the scientific community due to the fact that many vegetable farmers who use plant growth regulators (PGR's) see an increase in their productivity and quality of vegetables. I believe it can shed more light to this subject since many farmers are looking for ways in which they can be more productive in their operations and if government and other stakeholders can put more research in the use of PGR's, it can be more beneficial in the end.</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>The manuscript was technically sound since the author happened researched extensively on the subject matter and also explained in a way which is palatable to the average reader. I also would add that the researcher was able to cite sources to see how discriminate analysis was used in other peer reviewed journal articles.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references were sufficient however there were some citations which were outdated and the researcher could have been able to find more recent sources from at least 2015 to date. Some examples are listed below; Liu, D., Guo, W., Li, Q., & Xie, D. (2019). Effect of a plant growth regulator on optical properties of kiwifruit during growth in wavelength range of 950-1650 nm. Postharvest Biology and Technology, 156, 110918. An, L., Ma, J., Wang, H., Li, F., Qin, D., Wu, J., ... & Wu, X. (2018). NMR-based global metabolomics approach to decipher the metabolic effects of three plant growth regulators on strawberry maturation. Food chemistry, 269, 559-566.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript was appropriate 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:	Simon Thomas Sebuliba
Department, University & Country	University of Eswatini, Eswatini