

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	Regular article

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> Considering that the journal's policy is not to reject manuscripts only because of only based on 'lack of Novelty,' However, a manuscript's crucial for the scientific community depends on factors such as the novelty of its research, the significance and quality of its findings, its methodology. This manuscript is scientifically and technically average, it probably has less impact on the scientific community. However, they can still be valuable and useful for individuals and researchers active in the discussed area. [Explain the novelty of the work, the research gap it addresses in 2-3 sentences.] The title is not appropriate, repetitive, and lacks creativity. Many are similar to this title, and it should be changed entirely. Published articles available with similar titles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raghu Nandan Singh Khatana, Tarence Thomas, Akshita Barthwal, Tarun Kumar. Effect of NPK levels and Rhizobium on soil physico-chemical properties, growth, yield and economics of summer black gram (Vigna munga L.) var. Shekhar-2. Pharma Innovation 2021;10(8):1555-1561. Nitin Singh, Dr. Tarence Thomas, P Smriti Rao. Effect of different levels of N P K and rhizobium on soil physico-chemical properties and yield attribute of green gram (Vigna radiata l.) var. hum-2. Int J Chem Stud 2019;7(3):4486-4489. The abstract is somewhat comprehensive. There is no need to state the title of the manuscript anywhere in the abstract. It would be better if the Results and the Discussion were separate, but the subsections are good regarding the topic's comprehensiveness and the concepts' correlation. Yes, it seems scientifically correct, and the results are similar to previous scientific research and experimentation in this field. The materials and methods section could have more robust referencing. Similar and more up-to-date articles could also be added. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In my opinion, the language/English quality of this manuscript must be improved, and grammatically, it is not good. The manuscript should be carefully checked again for grammatical mistakes by the authors completely. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove "etc," from the keywords. In the introduction section, explanations about "Black gram" should be added in a separate paragraph. Such as: Black gram (Vigna Mungo L.) is an essential pulses crop ... At the end of the introduction section in the last line, there is no need to repeat and rewrite the title of the manuscript. The aim of this research should be written in the last paragraph of the introduction. In the conclusion section: The key findings of this manuscript are: [summarize 2-3 key 	

Review Form 1.7

	conclusions/discoveries in 1-2 brief sentences each]	
--	--	--

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:	Pegah Gheshlaghi
Department, University & Country	Hormozgan University, Iran