



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_50433
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF ORGANIC MANURE AND MULCHING ON THE GROWTH AND YIELD OF CARROT ( <i>Daucus carota</i> L.)
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>)

**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>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b></p> <p>Change "An experiment was conducted at the farm of..." to "An experiment on effect of organic manure &amp; mulching on the growth and yield of carrot was conducted at the farm of..."</p> <p>Modify the following paragraph: "The research consisted of two factors, Factor A: four levels of organic manure, O<sub>0</sub>: no organic manure), O<sub>1</sub>: Cowdung (20 ton/ha), O<sub>2</sub>: Vermicompost (10 ton/ha) and O<sub>3</sub>: Cowdung, 10 ton/ha + Vermicompost, 5 ton/ha and Factor B: four mulches, M<sub>0</sub>: No mulch, M<sub>1</sub>: Water hyacinth, M<sub>2</sub>: Black polythene and M<sub>3</sub>: Wood ash, respectively" to " The research consisted in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications under a factorial arrangement (of two factors), with Four levels of organic manure, as the factor A and four mulches such as factor B. "</p> <p>Remove "The experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications".</p> <p>Change "Organic manure and mulching influenced significantly all the studied parameters" to "Organic manure and mulching influenced significantly (p=??) all the studied variables".</p> <p><b>MATERIALS &amp; METHODS</b></p> <p>Lines 61-64: specify the geographical coordinates of the experimental site, likewise the physical and chemical characteristics of the soil. Lines 71-74: according to the methodology where specify the following: "I t 24.5mx whole experimental area was 5.75m was divided into three which blocks and each block was again divided into 16 plots and hence there were 48 (16 x 3) unit plots;" from my point of view it is a factorial design in split plots and not to Randomized Complete Block Design. Lines 86-90: The economic aspect of carrot crop was not reported in the</p>	



	<p>introduction.</p> <p><b>Statistical analysis</b></p> <p>Lines 92-96: We recommend adding regression analysis of pearson to verify the relationship between performance variables carrot with growth variables depending on the treatments.</p> <p><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b></p> <p><b>Plant height: The</b> results on plant height depending on the organic manure &amp; Mulching lack of statistical support according to the established methodology. It is necessary to add the results of analysis of variance, comparing the effects of factors and interaction based on treatments.</p> <p>Add to the results of Figures 1 (<b>effect of different organic manure on plant height</b>) and 2 (<b>effect of different mulches on plant height</b>), the statistical support (standard deviation for example).</p> <p>The results of Number of leaves per plant and Combined effect of organic manure and mulching (table 1), likewise results on <b>effect of different organic manure &amp; mulching on number of leaves (figures 3 &amp; 4)</b>, lack of statistical support. In general terms, all interpreted results were not analyzed under a factorial design in randomized complete block as indicated by the methodology, therefore, exist certain incongruity between the methodology with the results observed. The application of multiple comparisons test of means (Ducan test) is not observed either analysis of variance. It is noteworthy that almost all results were not properly compared and discussed with the similar findings of other authors.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>	<p>Change “<i>Keywords: Carrot, Daucus carota, mulching, organic manure</i>” to “<i>Keywords: Growtg, Yield, Daucus carota, mulching, organic manure,</i>”</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>Specify the yield and economic importance of carrote in Bangladesh.</p> <p><b>Change the following sentences:</b>          Line 103: “[22] reported similar results in plant height” to “Rashid and Shakur, [22] reported similar results in plant height.”          Line 113: “[22] reported that combined application of 6 ton/ha” to “Rashid and Shakur, [22] reported that combined application of 6 ton/ha”.          Line 130: “[23] state that the” to “Azarme et al.,[23] state that the”          Line 141: “[24] reported that the” to “Jaysawal et al., [24] reported that the”...          Lines 166, 167: “This finding is an agreement with the result of [25],” to “This finding is an agreement with the result of Schuch et al., [25],...”          Line 169: specify the value of “P” for the following sentences:          Line 169: “was significantly different (P=??)”          Line 172: “The combined effect of organic manures and mulches showed significant variation (P=??) on root length..”          Lines 170-171: “This result is in accordance with the findings of [26]” to “This result is in accordance with the findings of Rahman et al., [26].”          Lines 199-200: “[28] reported that combindly application of vermicompost..” to “[28] WAS NOT REPORTED IN THE REFERENCES reported that combindly application of vermicompost..”</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rahim Foroughbakhch</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Nuevo León, Mexico</b>