

### 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>

#### 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.	This manuscript contributes valuable insights into the effects of organic and inorganic fertilizers on brinjal growth and yield, promoting sustainable farming practices. It highlights the benefits of integrated nutrient management, offering both agronomic and economic advantages. The findings are useful for improving crop productivity while reducing reliance on synthetic fertilizers, making it a meaningful addition to agricultural research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is generally suitable, but it could be made more concise and specific. A suggested alternative could be: "Effect of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Yield, and Quality of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) During the Kharif Season" This title is direct and clearly reflects the study's focus on both fertilizer types and the impact on brinjal.	
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.	The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, there are a few areas where improvements could be made: 1. Inclusion of Methodology Details: The abstract could briefly mention the experimental design (RBD) and the treatments used, as this information would help readers understand the study's approach. 2. Clearer Mention of Results: While the abstract touches on the benefit: cost ratio, it could also briefly highlight the most significant findings in terms of growth, yield, and quality improvements, making the key results more prominent. 3. Revised Conclusion: The conclusion in the abstract could more explicitly mention the practical implications of the findings for brinjal cultivation, such as recommending the best fertilizer combination for optimizing growth and profitability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure is generally appropriate, with clear sections for the introduction, materials and methods, results and discussion, and conclusion. The subsections under "Results & Discussion" are well-organized and help break down the findings into manageable categories, such as growth parameters, yield attributes, and quality parameters. However, the flow between results and discussion could be improved by better integration of the two, rather than presenting them as separate entities. Additionally, the "Economic parameters" section could be consolidated with the "Yield and yield attributes" section to provide a more streamlined presentation of both biological and economic outcomes together.	
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	The manuscript is scientifically robust, as it employs a well-structured experimental design (Randomized Block Design) with appropriate treatments and replications, ensuring the reliability and reproducibility of the results. The statistical analysis through ANOVA strengthens the validity of the findings. Additionally, the study references established literature and aligns its results with previous research, such as those by Yadav et al. (2020) and Meena et al. (2019), supporting the	

### Review Form 3

sentences may be required for this part.	claims about the impact of integrated nutrient management on brinjal growth and yield. The manuscript also accurately addresses the effects of organic and inorganic fertilizers, showing a clear understanding of their role in enhancing plant health and productivity, making it technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could be more concise, and minor grammatical improvements would enhance readability. Overall, the language is appropriate but could benefit from refinement.	
Optional/General comments		

### **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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prathik K
Department, University & Country	Bangalore Institute of Technology, India