

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_127282
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of bat guano as a plant fertiliser on growth of Fenugreek ( <i>Trigonella foenum-graecum</i> L.) in sustainable agriculture
Type of the Article	Original 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)
<b>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.</b>	The manuscript is a good reflection on the importance of organic fertilizers particularly bats guano. As the usage of bat guano is currently diminishing in the market, the study would highlight its efficacy and possibly bring back the previous glory of guano. I like the study of different concentration of bats guano as written in the manuscript. It is well executed with a good basis of experimental design.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the article is suitable. However, the scientific name differs from subsection 3.2 where <i>T.foenum-graecum</i> turned to <i>T.foenum</i>	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract does not highlight the NPK content of plant and soil analysed and did not provide a clear deduction on the result.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	A stronger problem statement is needed, where it can touch on the notorious views of bats derived product particularly bats guano among the community, more so after Covid-19. Other than that an explanation on how the study can impact the Indian Fenugreek in terms of economy and sustainability could be inserted in to further strengthen the importance of the study. Additional subsection is recommended, where a section of the N-P-K results should be elaborated and compared among the three types (i.e., bat guano, vermicompost and control), I suggest to elaborate the N-P-K before subsection 3.2 as the sentence "It was observed that Bat guano applications enhance overall plant growth even though the NPK content was low," seemed to indicate the result.	
<b>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.</b>	Through my reading, the manuscript is scientifically correct and technically sound. The usage of bats guano had been applied since the early centuries in various countries, an optimum measurements of bat guano as fertilizers has been lacking in research therefore the study is vital in the agriculture community. The detection of the macro elements concentration in the study also shows the efficiency of an optimum level of bats guano.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments	There are several grammatical errors and sentence structure that could be improved. Please send the manuscript to an English reviewer for a thorough checking.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
Optional/General comments	Some general comments on the manuscript are as follows: 1. Recheck the name of the authors in Reference list and subsections (i.e. Grantina-levina and levinsh, 2015) 2. Recheck the citation format for the journal. The italicisation of et al in the manuscript is not uniformed throughout. 3. In subsection 3.3, please indicate which treatment obtained the maximum dry weight 3.21g/plant. 4. Please indicate the full sentence before using abbreviations (i.e. RDF+FYM and EC) 5. Please recheck the references, where scientific should be italicised.	

#### 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)
<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:	Siti Syamim Nurfatihah Binti Abd Rahman
Department, University & Country	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak, Malaysia