

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_127186
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating the Effect of Effective Rhizobia Bacteria on Nodulating, Yield and Yield Components of Faba bean
Type of the Article	Research 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.	The manuscript entitled "Evaluating the Effect of Effective Rhizobia Bacteria on Nodulating, Yield and Yield Components of Faba bean" is a good piece of works as it reflects the importance of pulse crop in agriculture and how nodulating bacteria can improve its yield.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, abstract is fine but one line statement for Rhizobium can be added to it to reflect its significance in legume crop	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Overall the manuscript is a good work of the authors. It shows the importance of Rhizobium in the plant productivity. However a few corrections are there which can be corrected in order to make the manuscript suitable for publication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More recent references can be added. Some references are very old (more than 10 years old), change them with the recent ones. Moreover, some more references can be added in the Introduction as well as discussion section as there are very few.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	In the result section, Standard error or standard deviation should be added along with the mean values. Also, some significance of variation is superscript while some are normal. Keep them all as same. Also, change the font style of references section. It is different from above manuscript.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mudassara Hasan
Department, University & Country	Aligarh Muslim University, India