

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130022
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Performance of High Density Planting System of Cotton in alfisols of Vikarabad district in Telangana
Type of the Article	Research Paper

#### **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: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	<b>Ultra narrow row planting technique is widely accepted method in cotton plantings and normally provides high yield and mechanical harvesting possibility for farmers. Author(s) tried to illustrate this valuable method in cotton farms.</b>	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Fair</b>	
<b>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.</b>	<b>Needs revision according to scientific abstract writing rules.</b>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	I couldn't see any statistical analysing method, treatments name and how they categorized in a design. Analyzing methods are not clear and enough. Results seem very weak and there is almost no conclusion.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References are neither enough nor recent.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Needs revision.	
<b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>		

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Farshid Talat</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>AREEO, IRAN</b>