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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments		
Minor REVISION comments	**The manuscript needs a moderate (not a minor) revision** • 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?	
Optional/General 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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mikias Biazen Molla**
Department, University & Country	**Hawassa University, Wondo Genet College of Forestry and Natural Resources, Ethiopia**