

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122293
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and economics of production of rooted black pepper (<i>Piper nigrum</i> L.) cuttings as affected by drenching cattle urine
Type of the 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)
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.	Yes, if this treatment works, it is important to get the dosage right. These results will be able to benefit farmers.	
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.	No. The format is not according to the journal's guidelines. I am missing a concluding sentence and I believe the information on the locality is unnecessarily detailed. The detail can be left for the methodology section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction is too short. <i>Trichoderma</i> and rooting powder are used, but not even mentioned. Methodology also not enough detail. What exactly is the control treatment? Probably the farm yard manure, potting soil and <i>Trichoderma</i> , but it is never explained. Are these cutting inside a nursery? Do they get irrigated or not? If yes, how much? Or are the potting bags outside and reliant on rain? Results and discussion – no <i>P</i> -values are given.	
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.	I have a few concerns. For an international journal, internationally recognised terms should be used. SI units should be used. More background on the reason for the study should be provided – what makes this study different from the other similar studies on black pepper? The actual conducting of the experiment seems sound, but there are a few missing bits of information, in my opinion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but the format is wrong as is the reference style used by the particular journal.	
Minor REVISION comments	Not really. See my suggestions on the document.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	I can see the value of the research, but the guidelines of the particular journal should be followed closely. That will iron out a lot of the problems.	

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>	

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anelia Marais
Department, University & Country	South Africa