



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_31573</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>STUDY ON OPTIMUM SIZE AND SHAPE OF BLOCKS IN UNIFORMITY TRIAL OF SUNFLOWER (Helianthus annus) CROP</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Full length research article</b>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper is very good. i have three major issues with the paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- The language has to be improved upon</li> <li>2- The experiment put in place made use of two methods (or approaches) which permitted the author to attain objectives of the study. If the author had presented graphs of the two models, especially the curvature method which shows the point at which the curve takes a turn (maximum curvature), and the Fairfield Smith's variance model or method, I think these would make the paper different ,and thus captivating to the reader.</li> </ol> <p>Results should be backed by arguments. Most at times results have been simply presented without giving reasons why results might be the way they are. References should thus appear if possible.</p>	<p>Improved upto some extent.</p> <p>Graphs included as per suggestions.</p> <p>Suggestions incorporated.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		