

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_117272
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of NPK, Vermicompost and FYM on Physico-chemical Properties of Soil Under Cluster bean (<i>Cyamopsis tetragonoloba</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Basically, the article provides a technology that addresses the problems of soil fertility and productivity. Based on the study results of the different alternative sources of nutrients, such as FYM and vermicompost, the use of NPK of 20:40:40 on cluster bean production positively affected soil health regarding physical and chemical properties. Therefore, this manuscript is relevant to the scientific community, particularly from a soil science perspective.</p> <p>2. The title is well stated.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is straightforward. However, I suggest indicating the P-value of the results and the different values of the best results on treatment 9, like PS (47.36 and 45.67) WHC and etc.</p> <p>4. Yes, it is correct in terms of structure. However, in the subsection of the Materials and Methods I suggest that the author will indicate how the study was carried out and the statistical process used.</p> <p>5. Yes. This research article found a technology to help soil health issues related to productivity and food production.</p> <p>6. A few references are obsolete. But several were recent. Additionally, in the Results and Discussion section, the author must indicate different citations to compare or contrast the study findings.</p> <p>Note: additional suggestion</p> <p>In the Introduction section, the gap is presented in the first few paragraphs, providing an important point for discussion and making it very straightforward to give the reasons for conducting the study. I suggest that the last paragraph of the introduction below this part: ... product that is as resilient and drought-tolerant as the cluster bean [8]. Young cluster bean pods are consumed as vegetables and are an inexpensive source of energy (16 Kcal), moisture (8 g), protein (3.2 g), fat (1.4 g), carbohydrate (10.8 g), vitamin-A (65.3 IU), vitamin-C (49 mg), calcium (57 mg) and iron (4.5 mg) for every 100 g of edible portion [9]. Thus, this study is conducted to determined-aim of the</p> <p>...Must mention the practical contributions of this study about using the mentioned sources of nutrients and the research aims.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. However, it can be enhanced to increase clarity.	
Optional/General comments	This paper can be accepted for publication with minor revisions.	

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:	Wenmark N. Magallon
Department, University & Country	J.H. Cerilles State College-Dumingag Campus, Philippines