

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122882</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECT OF ENRICHED PHOSPHOCOMPOST ON SOIL BIOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF PEARL MILLET IN VERTISOLS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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>
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.	The ideology was put forth by the researcher or author is correct for the benefits of farmer to utilize the phosphocompost for soil fertility improvement .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Good	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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 author wrote this manuscript is very much useful and the way in which interpretation of microbial and enzyme activity is very clear and sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Kindly check the spelling mistakes , grammar and alignment properly (Kindly refer the corrected article marked as red color font in your manuscript .	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The author should mention the role of phosphocompost and its improvement on soil fertility (Vertisols) Kindly strengthen the conclusion part with future thrust and how to meet out the nutrient requirement for agricultural crops Composting methods followed and its nutrient content etc., should be used and mention the significance to use phosphocompost Provide flow chart and photographs Characteristics table kindly add standard deviation values for each parameters.	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Murugaragavan Ramasamy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India</b>