

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_79032
Title of the Manuscript:	Seed Germination, Vegetative Growth and Flowering Performance of Cockscomb (Celosia cristata L.) in Response to Different Potting Media
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajahr.com/index.php/AJAHR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript needs a moderate (not a minor) revision <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The author/s has been raised an important ideas for specific spp. and location, but not new. The manuscript missed some of there is an essential issues/components to be revised (below). So, to me the manuscript needs a moderate revision.• Therefore, the authors should be come up to Novelty and clearly introduce the_scope the study.• The research design should be clear as much as possible and clearly show the producers how the three replications per treatment have been designed.• The research lack graphical/pictorial illustrations, that might be easily understand the process and output of the research• The discussion part is not well evaluated in comparison with other related and positively or negatively correlated research outputs• Please clearly explain the implication of your study. What implies to users, scientific communities, and policy and others.• As an expert what do recommend to improve further this Cockscomb genotypes?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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)	