

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_116786
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different level of N P K and Rhizobium on Soil Physico-chemical Properties and Yield attribute of Black gram (Vigna mungo L.) Var:Shekhar-2
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes, the findings of this manuscript is very important for scientific community.</b></p> <p>2. <b>I have not seen any yield attributes in the paper. I think, it was mis looked. However, you may still add the growth and yield attributes in the results if possible. You may write the title like this, "Effects of different levels of N P K and Rhizobium on Soil Physico-chemical Properties and Yield attribute of Black gram (Vigna mungo L. var:Shekhar-2)</b></p> <p>3. The abstract needs improvement.</p> <p>4. Yes, its appropriate, however, if I have to suggest, you may include also recommendations and acknowledgement.</p> <p>5. Yes, however, there are some parts that need to be improved like the statistical analysis. The researcher used randomized complete block design, then they used T-test to determine the significance of results. I think, ANOVA in factorial in RCBD is the most appropriate.</p> <p>6. Some of the references are old. If possible, please use recent articles (at least 5 to 10 years).</p> <p>I would like to suggest to include the growth and yield attributes in the results and discussion section since growth and yield attributes are mentioned in the abstract. Since the researcher used factorial in RCBD, you may used ANOVA in factorial in RCBD, then proceed to post hoc analysis if the results are significant or highly significant. Please provide also letter assigned to each parameter if ever the results are significant for proper discussion.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Grammarly score is 86 which is good. You may check and review the content of the manuscript, there are minor errors.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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:	<b>Jeffrey P. Villaver</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Agriculture Forestry and Environmental Studies, J.H. Cerilles State College, Philippines</b>