

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_86085
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Planting Time on Growth and Yield of Garlic ( <i>Allium sativum</i> L.) genotypes
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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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)
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>The manuscript entitled “Effect of Planting Time on Growth and Yield of Garlic (<i>Allium sativum</i> L.) genotypes” has good efforts from author regarding the effects of Time on Growth and Yield of Garlic. The article may be accepted after clarifying the following queries.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Abstract can be improved.</li><li>2. The literature covered in introduction need to be updated with recent findings.</li><li>3. Rephrase the objective of this work at the end of the introduction part.</li><li>4. In materials and methods: The authors should mention investigation month with year of planting.</li><li>5. Why the authors included old data (2009).</li><li>6. In result and conclusion section: the authors should cite recent references.</li><li>7. Rewrite the conclusion section informatively.</li><li>8. Many references missing in the reference section. Check it.</li><li>9. All the references should be change according to the journal format.</li><li>10. This manuscript has some types of misspellings. It is imperative that these are corrected and the language should be improved.</li></ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Already Improved</li><li>2. Improved</li><li>3. It is done accordingly</li><li>4. year already mentioned</li><li>5. Some data updated</li><li>6. some recent references included</li><li>7. done</li><li>8. Cheeked</li><li>9. Already done accordingly</li><li>10. It is now better than earlier.</li></ol>

### 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)	