

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125940
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization and Characterization of Panchagavya: Enhancing Nutrient Content and Seed Germination in Organic Farming
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)
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.	This manuscript contributes to the growing body of knowledge on organic farming practices, particularly the use of liquid organic fertilizers. The standardization and characterization of Panchagavya provide valuable insights into optimizing organic manure production. Its implications for nutrient enrichment, microbial activity, and seed germination are significant for promoting sustainable agriculture. However, the study could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of its broader applications and the inclusion of international comparative data.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and reflects the study's primary focus on Panchagavya and its effects on nutrient content and seed germination. However, the title could be slightly revised to emphasize its role in sustainable agriculture. Suggested alternative: " Standardization and Characterization of Panchagavya: A Sustainable Approach to Enhancing Nutrient Content and Seed Germination in Organic Farming. "	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but includes too much detail regarding the methodology. I suggest condensing the description of the ingredients and focusing more on the key results and implications. The information about the proportions of components could be reduced to provide more space for emphasizing the outcomes and significance of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the structure is appropriate. The manuscript follows a clear and logical flow from the introduction to methods, results, and discussion. However, the results and discussion section could be more concise, and the key findings should be better highlighted in relation to existing research.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design, with its 81 treatment combinations, is well-conceived, and the analytical methods used are appropriate and rigorous. The statistical tools, such as principal component analysis (PCA), are well-applied. However, a stronger justification for the selection of ingredient levels and more discussion on the practical implications of the results would improve the paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant but could be expanded to include more international studies on liquid organic fertilizers. Adding references from different geographic regions would provide a broader context for the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but certain sections could be simplified for better clarity. I suggest revising some complex sentences to make the manuscript more accessible to a wider audience.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Janak Singh Rawal
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal