

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_84078
Title of the Manuscript:	YIELD PERFORMANCE OF CUCUMBER (Cucumis sativus) AS INFLUENCED BY SEEDLING AGE AND TRAINING
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.journalaprij.com/index.php/APRJ/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	<div>1) (a) Keywords, (b) Purpose/Objectives of the study, (c) Literature Review, and (d) Findings sections are absent in this research study. Please include these important facets in this study.</div> <div>2) Under clarity in problem, definition and objectives, researcher did not identify the research questions/problems.</div> <div>3) In Conclusion section researcher should include a summary of what you have achieved with the work you describe in the paper, stressing its novelty and relevance and also include major findings/conclusion followed by brief discussion on future perspectives and /or application of present work to other disciplines. In conclusion researcher did not use a single word for future direction/scope of the study</div>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<div>1) Add “Keywords” section</div> <div>2) Add “Objectives of the Study” section.</div> <div>3) Add “Literature Review” section</div> <div>4) Add “Findings” Section</div> <div>5) Minor revision is required in Conclusion section</div>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Comment to Major Revision	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Santosh Kumar Tunga
Department, University & Country	Rishi Bankim Chandra Evening College, India