

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_116724</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of zinc and humic acid application on growth parameter, yield and yield components and quality traits of black gram (Vigna mungo L.)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>Research work carried out by the author is important for the community.</p> <p>Title of article is suitable.</p> <p>I request author to make article comprehensive. Please include research methodology, data analysis tool and conclusion of your research clearly. Further, its not recommended to mention objective of research in detail in abstract section.</p> <p>Better to write different context on different paragraphs of Introduction. Mention data analysis method in methodology section. Incorporate table within result and discussion section. No need to write full treatment everywhere; mention T1,T2,T3 etc.</p> <p>Level of significance is not mentioned in table, mean difference is not differentiated; without this statistical analysis is not scientific and valid.</p> <p>Please cite everything you reviewed. Some citation is missing in discussion part.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Better to write simple sentence rather than compound/complex. Sentence structure is not organized while writing discussion part. Synthesize the literature before writing.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>Please correct the citation format; cite only in one format. Avoid citing like this Jack <i>et al.</i> (2000) <sup>[05]</sup> No need to mention objective in methodology section. Avoid writing like this: The findings of the present study as well as relevant discussion have been presented under following heads. Better to write more number of ....rather than Maximum number of root nodules/branches etc. Write uniform measurement units.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Milan Acharya</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nepal</b>