

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126542
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Nutrient Management for Enhanced Performance in Kadiri Lepakshi Groundnut
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	Yes. Concrete experimental data are provided. The results indicate that Phosphogypsum is an effective source of calcium and sulfur to increase peanut yield.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	YES	
<b>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.</b>	YES. I recommend bringing the abstract to 300 words as indicated in the "General Guideline for Authors"	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	YES	
<b>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.</b>	Concrete experimental data are provided. The results are clearly presented in tables and figures. The analysis of the results of the different treatments applied indicates that Phosphogypsum is an effective source of calcium and sulfur to increase peanut yield.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -	YES. I recommend redoing the Sec. References as outlined in the "General Guideline for Authors" References 7 and 8 are not cited in the body of the work	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	YES I include a couple of shape corrections in the text	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	I recommend considering including a figure with the location of the study area	

#### **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>Guillermo Martín Caille</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National University of Patagonia San Juan Bosco (UNPSJB), Argentina</b>