

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126879
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF APPLICATION OF NPK, FERMENTED ORGANIC MANURES AND MYCORHIZA ON YIELD AND PRODUCTION OF GREEN GRAM (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) var. PDM-139.
Type of the Article	ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF APPLICATION OF NPK, FERMENTED ORGANIC MANURES AND MYCORHIZA ON YIELD AND PRODUCTION OF GREEN GRAM (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) var. PDM-139.

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 work is relevant to the journal and can contribute additional insights to scientific communities	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	- Economic Benefits of NPK and Organic Amendments on Green Gram Yield."	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	-not	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	-	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>-should be thoroughly edited</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Although the study addresses an important topic in agricultural research, it could benefit from a clearer presentation, a more robust methodological explanation, a deeper analysis of results, and an improved overall structure. Addressing the following points would strengthen the paper significantly.</p> <p>1- Title -The title is somewhat long and could be more concise. It may benefit from being streamlined to focus on key elements, such as "Economic Benefits of NPK and Organic Amendments on Green Gram Yield."</p> <p>2- Abstract -The abstract is informative but could be shortened. It should focus on key findings and implications rather than detailed experimental design. -Little background is provided on why the study is significant, such as the importance of green gram in agriculture or the relevance of sustainable practices.</p> <p>3- Introduction -The introduction lacks sufficient references to prior studies. Including more background on previous research would provide a stronger foundation for the current study. -While pulse demand and production statistics are mentioned, their relevance to the study is not clearly articulated. -The study's specific objectives should be more clearly stated to guide the reader's understanding.</p> <p>4- Materials and Methods Experimental Design: While a 3x3 Randomized Block Design (RBD) is mentioned, the methodology section could be strengthened by more detail on replication and control measures. -The author should include soil and Climatic Conditions and additional information on soil health, fertility levels, and climatic conditions before the experiment could provide context for the results. -The statistical methods, including the rationale for using ANOVA and its assumptions, could be explained more thoroughly.</p> <p>5-Results -Tables are used effectively, but some results could be better illustrated with graphs or figures for clarity. -There are inconsistencies in the reported figures, and treatment combinations could confuse readers. -The discussion could integrate how the results compare with previous studies or expected outcomes based on existing literature. -In Table 6, the last column should be the Cost ratio rather than the cost-benefit ratio; if the calculation is done in such regard, none of the treatments would be selected; CBR>1, means there is a loss.</p> <p>6-Discussion -The discussion lacks depth in analyzing the implications of the findings. More emphasis on practical applications and limitations would be beneficial. -Economic Analysis- there could be a more detailed exploration of cost-benefit implications for farmers.</p> <p>6-Conclusion -The conclusion reiterates findings but should reflect broader implications for agricultural practices. -The recommendations for future research or practical applications could be included.</p> <p>Language and Grammar: The paper contains several grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that may hinder readability.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Gezimu Gelu Otoro</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Kitami Institute of Technology, Japan</p>