

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115859
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of organic nutrients on growth and yield of summer Greengram (Phaseolus radiata L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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. 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. The scientific value of the manuscript is low, considering that the study was carried out in one season/year and one location. The results of the study can be important for farmers community from UP.</p> <p>3. The abstract has no background regarding the importance of the study. The aim/objective of the study was not concretely/clearly presented in the abstract. Too many details regarding the experimental design are presented in the abstract. You have to explain that the growth parameters values from the abstract are associated to T9.</p> <p>5. Too many keywords. At the end of the Introduction section, you must explain the aim of the study and the possible outcomes that your study can reveal. In the M&amp;M section, the nine treatments must be clearly presented (as in the tables 1, 2). Explain what statistical test (LSD, Tukey, Duncan, Newman-Keuls, ) was used in order to compare the treatments mean for different traits. Gomez and Comez are not included in the reference list. The conclusions are very briefly. You must add more detail to certify the value of your results. In the Tables 1, 2, you must use letters in order to express the significance of differences between treatments.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Major editing/improvement of English language are necessary.	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I consider that the manuscript needs substantial revisions/improvements before it can be considered for publication.	

**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>Adriana Ciulca</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Life Sciences, Romania</b>