

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118530
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of NPK Zinc and Iron on Soil Health and Yield Parameters of Green Gram (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.) var SML-668
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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes but "during the Zaid season of the year 2023" should be removed from the abstract</p> <p>Yes but the sections and subsections should be numbered. eg "Introduction should be 1. Introduction", "Materials and Methods. Should be 2. Materials and Methods." etc.</p> <p>The results presented in this manuscript seems correct.</p> <p>1. References in the body of the manuscript should not be in bold. 2. Using difference reference style in a manuscript is not scientifically good for manuscripts, authors should adopt the standard reference style of the journal.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The grammatical errors in the manuscript should be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Conclusion should be improved. Summarize the main findings of your results presented in the manuscript. Highlight important outcomes that reflect the significance of your work. Consider limitation of your work and future research.</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:

Name:	Omamoke O. E. Enaroseha
Department, University & Country	Delta State University, Nigeria

Review Form 1.7