

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121887
Title of the Manuscript:	Compatability of most efficient Rhizobium strain with different seed dressing fungicides in Mungbean crop.
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.	The paper is significant for scientific community because such research has significant impacts on crop production as well as in the field of agriculture and crop science. Moreover, the researcher(s) conducted an experimental study including numerous treatments that evaluated the effectiveness of fungicide applications on crop growth and yield. Hence, such kind of study is highly appreciable; however there are few limitations to attain the precise and desired outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable. However, confusion exists over there. (Please check the reviewed manuscript.)	
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.	Highly recommended to rewrite/edit the abstract part of this article following the reviewer's comments and correct the text accordingly. (Check the attachment).	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript can be accepted only for publication if the author(s) revise the paper point-by-point and improve the manuscript accordingly.	
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>Presentation: Good and in an acceptable form.</p> <p>Abstract: Need to improve the text. Sentence structure is confusing in some cases.</p> <p>Introduction: not okay (need improvement; check the attached review). Use reference properly.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: Not so good. Need to improve the text and elaborate precisely.</p> <p>Results: Good enough. Several changes required (check the reviewer's comments). Presentation of key findings with some figures is not clear in some cases. Obviously mention the statistical values to justify the result/findings.</p> <p>Discussion: Need improvement (check the review). Compare the findings of this study with the findings of similar and recent research. Highly recommended to provide suitable recommendations and suggestions at the end.</p> <p>Conclusion: Okay. Nevertheless, specify the key findings with appropriate conclusion.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reviewer encourages the author(s) to check each and every reference precisely, use more reference, and arrange it perfectly according to the Journal's format for better representation.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several grammatical mistakes; • Revise and improve the manuscript following reviewer's comments before final submission; • Major revisions required ; • Need clarification in some points; • Author(s) should check the English language, typographical, grammatical errors, scientific name, etc. very cautiously. 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript can be accepted for publication if the author(s) revise the paper point-by-point and improve the manuscript accordingly.	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shourav Dutta
Department, University & Country	Rangamati Science and Technology University, Bangladesh