

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123719
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimization of nano-DAP fertilization for improvement in growth and yield of finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> (L.) Gaertn.)
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The topic of this work is important for the scientific community. However, I appreciate that the author should pay more attention to the determined indicators and the way of representing the results obtained. According to my knowledge, it is necessary to present the obtained data either in the form of Tables or in the form of Figures, not both.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Too long Abstract (372 words). Please respect Instructions for authors. https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/about/submissions</p> <p>The abstract should be concise and informative. It should not exceed 300 words in length.</p> <p>I appreciate that the first three sentences from Methodology can be deleted. I recommend that you explain each abbreviation at their first apparition in text. Please write mL and not ml, everywhere it is needed. The last sentence in the Methodology presents the results obtained and as a result must appear in the Results subsection. In her place, I appreciate that you should have presented the determined parameters.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>As I stated above, I appreciate that the Abstract should be redone. Also, in the Material and Methods section, a better structuring and certain details regarding the determined parameters and the way of expressing the results would be needed. Attention must be paid to the way the Figures are prepared (if this way of presentation is chosen). I made observations on the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes, but, please respect Instructions for authors.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Delian Elena
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomical Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Bucharest, Romania