



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_49307
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Levels of Nitrogen and Filter mud on Tomato Vegetative Growth Yield and Yield Components
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The Experimental Design of the Study is RCBD factorial since it has two factors (Nitrogen Level and Mud Level). Thus the tables should be presented in such a way that the effect of the individual factors (Mud and Nitrogen Levels) and their interaction should be highlighted. Example:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TREATMENT</th> <th>Plant height, cm</th> <th>No. of Primary Branches</th> <th>No of leaves</th> <th>Stem girth, cm</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N-Level , kg/ha</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>43</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>86</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mud Level, t/ha</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>N x M</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CV,%</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>You can refer to Gomez and Gomez Statistical Procedure for Agricultural Research or other related books for guidance.</p> <p>Presentation of interaction table is not appropriate like Table 3. It should be a two-way table as shown below:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>TREATMENT</th> <th colspan="3">MUD LEVEL, t/ha</th> </tr> <tr> <th>N LEVEL, kg/ha</th> <th>0</th> <th>2</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>43</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>86</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Cost and return analysis should be presented to determine optimum levels of N and mud and the most profitable treatment combination.</p>	TREATMENT	Plant height, cm	No. of Primary Branches	No of leaves	Stem girth, cm	N-Level , kg/ha					0					43					86					Mud Level, t/ha					0					2					4					N x M					CV,%					TREATMENT	MUD LEVEL, t/ha			N LEVEL, kg/ha	0	2	4	0				43				86				<p>The tables in the article give same image.</p> <p>The tables in the article give same image.</p>
TREATMENT	Plant height, cm	No. of Primary Branches	No of leaves	Stem girth, cm																																																																									
N-Level , kg/ha																																																																													
0																																																																													
43																																																																													
86																																																																													
Mud Level, t/ha																																																																													
0																																																																													
2																																																																													
4																																																																													
N x M																																																																													
CV,%																																																																													
TREATMENT	MUD LEVEL, t/ha																																																																												
N LEVEL, kg/ha	0	2	4																																																																										
0																																																																													
43																																																																													
86																																																																													
Minor REVISION comments	The rationale behind the research should be concretized and clearly discussed.																																																																												
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	