

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126414
Title of the Manuscript:	Different Sowing Media and Variety Affecting Physiological Performance of Early Cauliflower and Correlation Studies of Curd Yield with Physiological Parameters
Type of the Article	Original

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.	Its important from the view of nursery management and as well as early establishment of crop need to be supported by growing media, so this study put light on that gap The way of presentation of data and language used is not much impressing	Included yield data in the table 2 and related with physiological parameters
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Need to be corrected	Title is changed as per suggestion
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.	Look the manuscript	Done as per suggestion
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	okay	
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.	Please before going to accept or rewrite, answer these question which found genuine <ol style="list-style-type: none">Why growth parameters are not considered, ultimately yield is the best way expressing the influence media and planting material, without considering those parameters, why research was interested in understanding only the intrinsics physiological parametersWhat analysis was done?? Correlation means spearman or any other correlationNowhere in the methodology you explained about the growth and yieldNo single article from last five years in the manuscript	1.Actually I have already published research paper on ‘Seedling Growth, Field Performance and Economics of Production of Early Cauliflower as Influenced by Different Sowing Media and Variety under Greenhouse Condition in Assam, India” in <i>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports Volume 30, Issue 6, Page 502-510, 2024; Article no.JSRR.116645 ISSN: 2320-0227</i> . Yet, I am giving the yield data to relate the interaction of physiology and yield in the table 2 2. Factorial RBD analysis was done. It is Pearson’s correlation coefficient 3. Included curd yield(Table3) 4. Recent reference from October,2024 & 2022 journal is included.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No, Need improvement, whole manuscript is having minimal references, i.e., 11	Increased the number to 15 with recent reference of year 2022& 2024
Minor REVISION comments	Need to improve	Tried Maximum
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Accept with major revisions and editors can resent for the review	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	