



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_57070
Title of the Manuscript:	GROWTH AND YIELD OF THREE TURMERIC VARIETIES (<i>Curcuma longa</i> L.) UNDER MANGO BASED AGROFORESTRY SYSTEM
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 manuscript aimed to test the effect of mango shade on germination, growth and production of turmeric varieties.</p> <p>I liked the article, however, I have some comments. I suggest that a more complete description be made of the justification for choosing the mango for association in the Agroforestry System. What is the evidence for the association of mangoes with turmeric? Still in the introduction, I suggest explaining the hypotheses, or even the expected results, according to the literature.</p> <p>For the methodology, the experiments were explained in a clear and objective way therefore, I see no need for change.</p> <p>In the results item, I would like to suggest the discussion of the results obtained with more studies analyzing similar samples of Agroforestry Systems in other areas with similar environmental conditions. Therefore, the search for more references in the literature related to the theme of the manuscript is quite satisfactory.</p> <p>Still in the discussion of the results, sentences such as "which are statistically similar" or "were statistically almost similar" were found, I would like to suggest that along with these terms were presented what were the statistical results that allowed these conclusions. It was not clear, what were the statistical analyzes and what were the statistical results that allowed these conclusions.</p> <p>Finally, in the discussion of the results, it was observed that the yield of fresh turmeric increased with increasing light, however, according to the work of Srikrishnah and Sutharsan (2015) they found that the shade is the most suitable for cultivation in turmeric. I suggest a more detailed discussion about this difference between the results of Srikrishnah and Sutharsan (2015) and I also suggest the search for other articles that present divergent results for further analysis and discussions.</p> <p>In general, the manuscript is robust and technically solid, which allows its approval.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>A simple article, with few analyzes, however, I believe that it fulfilled its main objectives. Among the presentation of the results, I suggest the construction of graphics, or even illustrations so that the results are better analyzed visually, which facilitates the understanding of the results and well comparisons between the analyzed varieties.</p>	
Optional/General comments	No additional 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:	Camila Galvão Fróes
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil