

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121629
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of NPK, Rhizobium Conjugated with FYM on Physico-Chemical properties of Soil for Cluster Bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) Cv. Radha SPL.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript sounds technically good in integrated potency to use organic and inorganic stuff to improvise soil health and crop production. In addition, it also revealed effectiveness and efficiency of rhizobium used in the experiment. However, multilocational trails might be helpful to check its reliability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Impact of NPK, Rhizobium and FYM on Physico-Chemical properties of Soil for Cluster Bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.) Cv. Radha SPL.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is poorly written and lacking in clarity of experiment conducted. Rest addition & deletion are mentioned in manuscript	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	OK	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Manuscript sounds technically good in integrated potency to use organic and inorganic stuff to improvise soil health and crop production. In addition, it also revealed effectiveness and efficiency of rhizobium used in the experiment. However, multilocational trails might be helpful to check its reliability. However, nonsignificant, minimum and negative results need not to mentioned in manuscript as decline its reliability and usefulness among research communities	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No, recent references need to added. In addition, Reference style should be checked and matched with manuscript text.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not at all. It is grammatically wrong, sounds weak and technically inappropriate.	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript needs rigorous revision before proceeding further.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shivam Sharma
Department, University & Country	DAV University, India