

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_123561
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF DIFFERENT LEVELS OF UPTAKE STIMULANTS ON THE YIELD OF DOLICHOS BEAN (LABLAB PURPUREUS)
Type of the Article	Research 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

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 selected topic is most appropriate and the research is well timed. The uptake stimulants are major role for enhancing the growth and yield of Dolichos bean. This research was focused on effect of different levels of uptake stimulants on the yield of Dolichos bean. Some of the stimulants are highly needed for the better plant growth. In that way, the research is done by the authors.</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>The abstract is thorough. Major changes are there. The year and yield data are making confusions when compared to methodology and result.</p> <p>I mentioned in the manuscript by using track changes.</p> <p>It contains all the necessary details about the experiment.</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>Yes, The research paper is scientifically written. But the statistical tool is not mentioned in methodology. In results part, the authors have written well. But discussion section not written. More additional points should be needed in the discussion part with recent citations.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>References are not sufficient which means referred articles are very old year. Add recent references with related to the title</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, If major corrections are corrected</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Major corrections are identified and mentioned in the original manuscript by using track changes. Authors should focus seriousness on writing research paper.</p> <p>The authors gave sufficient data for this particular topic.</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:	D. Gokul
Department, University & Country	Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan University, India