

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120232
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of Macronutrients and Rhizobium on Soil Health and yield attributes of Field Pea (Pisum Sativum L.)
Type of the Article	Research paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The study addresses an important aspect of agricultural science and contributes valuable insights into the use of macronutrients and Rhizobium in Field Pea cultivation. However, the authors need to improve the overall writing quality by correcting grammatical errors and ensuring clarity and coherence. They should also improve on data presentation ensuring that all figures and tables are of high quality and should be self-explanatory with clear captions. The authors should do a lot of desktop review to justify the study. Stick to Rhizobium (nitrogen fixing bacteria) as the title indicates without mixing with PSB or consider a broader term 'Biofertilizers'. No mention of PSB use in methodology.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Review the work in terms of materials and methods and consider any of the titles below: 'Impact of Macronutrient Levels and Rhizobium on Soil Health and Field Pea Yield" 'Optimizing Soil Health and Field Pea Yield: The Role of Macronutrients and Rhizobium' 'Enhancing Field Pea Productivity through Macronutrient and Rhizobium Interactions' 'Soil Health and Yield Improvement in Field Peas through Macronutrient and Rhizobium Management'</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is informative but could be more comprehensive if more concise. Provide clear aim, most critical methodologies, and findings. Ensure that the key results are presented with quantitative data to provide a clearer picture of the significance of the findings. Address existing minor grammatical issues such as 'The texture of the soil in the experimental region was sandy loam' to 'The soil texture in the experimental region was sandy loam'. Replace 'The design was set up using randomized block design' with 'The experiment was conducted using a randomized block design'. Consider the above issues to improve the Abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The introduction provides sufficient background on the importance of Field Pea and Rhizobium. However, it could be improved by adding more recent references and highlighting gaps in the current research. The flow and structure need to be improved. The transition between paragraphs should be smoother to enhance readability. Add information with citation to explain the importance of sustainable agriculture in the context of this study. Research objectives need to be clearly stated at the end of the introduction to set the context for the study.</p> <p>On Materials and Methods, provide clear and elaborate description of the experimental design in a schematic manner for better understanding. Specify the number of replications and clarify the treatments clearly and precisely to avoid confusion. Clarify the sources and preparation of Rhizobium and other biofertilizers used. State the data collected and at what stages concretely, include details about the statistical methods used for data analysis.</p> <p>On Results and Discussions, data presentation needs improvement. The tables should be more integrated into the text with frequent reference to them and explain their significance in the context of the study. Redo the tables to remove longitudinal borders. Enhance the discussion by comparing current study findings with previous research to help in establishing the relevance and impact. Discuss in detail the potential mechanisms behind the observed effects of macronutrients and Rhizobium on soil health and yield attributes. Do more search on similar or related studies.</p> <p>The conclusion should summarize the findings. It should briefly mention the limitations of the study and suggest areas for future research. Highlight practical implications for farmers more explicitly, making it clear how they can apply the findings.</p> <p>References: Ensure all references are recent/current and relevant to the study. Check the consistency and format of the references according to the journal guidelines.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Scientifically, the study is accepted. The authors however need to clearly justify why the study was conducted and its implication on soil health as well as pea yield. Field pea is a legume that fixes nitrogen, justify why there is need to bring in Rhizobium. The methodology needs to be clear and flow systematically providing all the details, how many replications, how many seasons, what variety was used. Type of data collected and at what intervals, how it was analysed and if there were any significant differences observed. Economic analysis of the Rhizobium would help inform if the technology is worth adopting by the farmers or not. Elaborate on the implications of your findings for cotton cultivation and soil management practices in the study area. Consider summarizing the key findings at the end of each subsection to boost the main points</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>While the references are recent, they are not sufficient. The authors need to improve on the background literature in the introduction section to enhance on literature list. There is need to read more comparing the current study with previous work in the results and discussions.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality needs quite some improvement in structure and flow of sentences.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Highlight any significant patterns or anomalies observed in the results obtained. Elaborate the implications of the findings on pea cultivation and soil management. While doing literature review, it is important to read, understand and rephrase information rather than just lifting and pasting without acknowledging the information source as a reference. Major revisions needed before acceptance for publication. Revisit the author guidelines and adhere to what is provided.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Caroline Agamala Kundu</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>International Fertilizer Development Centre, Kenya</p>