SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRAF_46143**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of growing media on growth and flowering of cymbidium orchid (Cymbidium spp) in Godawari, Nepal**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. **Abstract:** Use of Agronomy practice and farmer practice media as synonym to one other is confusing. Nowhere in the text had/have author/authors mentioned about it. 2. **Introduction:** Poorly written without proper background. Failed to include recent scientific findings. No proper sequence in following paragraphs. 3. **Material and method:** It would have been better if the exact name of species is used with proper scientific identification as *Cymbidium* itself is a genus with around dozen taxa reported from Nepal. Why the author/authors tried to choose 2 seasons is not justified? Why the author/authors choose 5-year-old plants need to be justified? What analysis tools was/were used to perform ANOVA? Author /authors mentioned "three factors", "variable" would be the better term to use. 4. **Results:** A heading "**Result and discussion**" is given and later appears a separate section with heading "**Discussion**", what are the differences between two? Findings of the research is satisfactory among other sections, however, its poorly presented. Further, no photographic evidences of the conducted research. These types of works look better if photograph and other images are included. 5. **Discussion:** Little or no efforts have been given in writing discussion. Similar to introduction, I suggest author/authors to use recently published literature. 6. **References and Citations:** As mentioned cited literature are old. I suggest author/authors to use recent (after 2010) research article. Reference to" AEC, 2009" is not found. Lack of uniformity in reference styles. Please avoid self citations.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Please modify the title based on the exact name of species	

SDI Review Form 1.6

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Bikram Pandey***
Department, University & Country	***University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, China***