



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAHR_45905</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Assessment of production constraints of large cardamom in the eastern hills of Nepal</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original 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>)

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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 important as it provides information to improve the productivity of large cardamom in Nepal</p> <p>The introduction and the objectives are poor</p> <p>The results directly explain the causes of the decrease in the yield of large cardamom. although current productivity data are presented, it is not specified how much has decreased in recent years, nor are the results of the surveys shown, as indicated in Materials and Methods, which will be analyzed with the Statistical Package for Social Science ( SPSS). There are no data to support the causes that arise.</p> <p>The results presented have no scientific basis, and can be interpreted as speculations of the author</p> <p>The conclusions lack scientific rigor</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The paper lacks scientific rigor due to the lack of presentation of the results obtained and its corresponding analysis. The incorporation of this information is fundamental for the publication of the paper	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Martín Maria Silva Rossi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Argentina</b>