

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126807
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.)
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	It is a good experiment conducted,	
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.	It should be more relevant and specific. Abstract can be modified with sharp testimonials.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure is appropriate. Abbreviations or full forms should be used on their first use in the main text of the article. Restructure of sentences can be done throughout the manuscript. More relevant citations can be incorporated. Conclusion should be revised and to the point.	
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.	Writing is not good. It should be better explained. Discussion can be better with use of proper reference addition. Statistical analysis of data needs to be discussed with CV and CD. In results things should be discussed in a proper manner. I couldn't find any information concerning the photographic documentation. Importance of the performed work is not mentioned anywhere. However, I have made some changes for as examples to the authors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More relevant references can be added.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is of very very basic and inappropriate sentence formations. Quality of English can be improved.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Manuscript can consider after major corrections.	

#### **PART 2:**

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

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Irshad Ali Saudagar
Department, University & Country	ICFRE-TFRI, India