

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121985
Title of the Manuscript:	Ascertaining Impact of Potassium Schoenite (Mahalaabh) on the Yield and its Attributes in Wheat, Mustard and Onion
Type of the Article	Original 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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 study's focus on Potassium Schoenite (Mahalaabh) and its impact on the yield of essential crops like wheat, mustard, and onion is timely and relevant, given the ongoing challenges of food security and environmental sustainability. I appreciate the manuscript for its rigorous experimental design and its potential contribution to improving agricultural practices, particularly in nutrient-deficient regions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Ascertaining Impact of Potassium Schoenite (Mahalaabh) on the Yield and its Attributes in Wheat Mustard and Onion," is descriptive but could be more concise and engaging. A suggested alternative title could be: "Evaluating the Efficacy of Potassium Schoenite (Mahalaabh) on Yield Enhancement in Wheat, Mustard, and Onion."</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 comprehensive but could benefit from clearer structure and emphasis on key findings. I suggest highlighting the specific yield improvements observed for each crop and the methods used to achieve these results. Additionally, including a brief statement on the statistical significance of the findings would add depth.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized. The manuscript follows a logical flow from introduction to methodology, results, and discussion, which aids in reader comprehension.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, with a well-executed experimental design and thorough statistical analysis. The use of a Randomized Block Design (RBD) and the detailed comparison of different treatment methods lend credibility to the findings. However, the study would benefit from a more critical discussion of potential limitations and how these might impact the generalizability of the results. The treatments in the tables and results have been indicated by the letter T from T1 to T9 and this is not clear in the materials and methods.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -</p>	<p>The references are generally sufficient</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript contains minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing that need to be addressed to enhance readability. I recommend a thorough proofreading and possibly a professional language editing service to improve the overall quality. The tables and figures should be more clearly labelled and formatted to improve readability. Including a brief explanation of the statistical significance in the captions would also be helpful.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This manuscript presents valuable findings that contribute to the understanding of nutrient management in agriculture. With some revisions, it has the potential to make a meaningful impact in the field.</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:	Hussein J. Shareef
Department, University & Country	University of Basrah, Iraq