

**ReviewForm1.7**

JournalName:	<b>JournalofAdvancesinBiology&amp;Biotechnology</b>
ManuscriptNumber:	<b>OriginalManuscript_JABB_118052</b>
TitleoftheManuscript:	<b>Effectofcustomizedfertilizerapplicationonphysiologicalaspectsofchickpea(CicerarietinumL.)</b>
Typeof theArticle	

[ReviewForm1.7](#)

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write a few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, this research addresses the impact of customized fertilizer application on the physiological aspects of chickpea cultivation, which is highly relevant given the increasing need for sustainable agriculture practices and food security, especially in pulse production. This study is pertinent for the scientific community as it offers insights into optimizing fertilizer use to improve crop yield and health, contributing to more efficient agricultural practices.</li> <li>Yes, it clearly reflects the manuscript's content and focus.</li> <li>The abstract provides a good summary of the research's objectives, methodology and key findings. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the significance of the findings and their implications for agricultural practices. This would provide a clearer snapshot of the research impact.</li> <li>The manuscript's structure with designated sections for the introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion is standard and appropriate for scientific papers. Each section is well-defined, though some subsections could benefit from further elaboration to enhance clarity, particularly in the <b>results section</b> where more detailed explanations of the data might help in understanding the impact of different fertilizer treatments. For <b>results and discussion</b> section, it lacks a thorough comparative analysis with existing research, which is essential for establishing the study's relevance and novelty. The statistical analysis needs more detail, including specifics on p-values and statistical assumptions. Mechanistic explanations of how customized fertilizers affect chickpea physiology are also missing, weakening the scientific depth of the discussion. Furthermore, the integration of results and discussion could be improved by clearly distinguishing between the presentation of data and its interpretation. The section also tends toward broad generalizations from specific results and would be better if it discusses the limitations and generalizability of the findings. Practical implications and recommendations for future research are notably absent, which could otherwise enhance the manuscript's impact. Lastly, references to figures and tables need to be more explicit, ensuring that readers can easily follow and understand the data presented. <b>Conclusion:</b> This section needs a greater clarity and specificity, explicitly linking its findings back to the study's objectives to demonstrate its impact on existing knowledge. It currently lacks discussion on the practical implications of the results, which is crucial for agricultural applications. Also, including recommendations for future research and reflecting on the study's limitations would provide a more comprehensive and balanced view.</li> <li>Yes.</li> <li>No. Currently, there is a lack of references from the past five years, which are necessary to ensure the information is up-to-date.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	Moderate	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**ReviewForm1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Ewe Lay Sheng</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Energy University, Malaysia</b>