

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_119842
Title of the Manuscript:	“Sulfur Synergy: Improving Black Soybean (Glycine max (L.) Merrill) Yields with Varied Sources and levels” Variety – VL Bhat 201
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is more appropriate for readers who are agricultural practitioners. The results obtained will be directly utilized by farmers to increase the production of black soybeans they cultivate. However, this manuscript can also be developed by academics to strengthen knowledge about the effects of sulphur treatment. 2. The title of this manuscript is quite appropriate to the content presented 3. There is no abstract displayed on the manuscript I received 4. The subsections are quite appropriate 5. This manuscript is quite acceptable scientifically, but I note that it needs development, especially in the analysis section. In my opinion, it would be better if the data obtained were further analyzed to determine the significance of differences between treatments 6. In my opinion, the references displayed are very lacking and almost all the references used are very old. <p>The references used to make claims regarding the novelty of research do not appear to be sufficient arguments for conducting research when viewed from the perspective of scientific development (see the first paragraph in the introduction).</p> <p>This manuscript is quite simple and easy to understand, but in my opinion it is too simple for the development of science. My suggestion is that you can carry out further statistical analysis to strengthen your argument.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alfred Umbu Kuala Ngaji
Department, University & Country	State Agricultural Polytechnic of Kupang, Indonesia