

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_130766
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF SPACING AND PLANTING METHOD ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF RADISH (Raphanus sativus) UNDER CONTRASTING CONDITIONS OF DRY AND WET SEASONS
Type of the Article	Research article

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:  
<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**  
Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>  
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is important as it focuses on valuable edible plant used across the world. It provides suggestions and recommendation about the culturing practices of this plant. However, the materials and part of this manuscript need to be improved to include additional factors regarding the culturing practices of the plant.	The manuscript focused only on spacing and planting methods. Cultural practices were already captured in materials and methods section.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable to the context of the manuscript	Thanks
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes. It is.	Ok
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is correct. The statistical analysis section seems to be missing.	Done
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, they are recent references.	Noted
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the manuscript English language is good. It needs some improvements since there are some minor language issues.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript is suitable for publication.	Thanks

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	