

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_120966
Title of the Manuscript:	Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) Nodulation, Nitrogen Fixation, and Net Nitrogen Balance Response to Starter Nitrogen and Phosphorus Fertilizer Rates in the Semi-Arid Tigray Region of Ethiopia
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.	It is an important for scientific community. Importance of characterized the available germplasm. Section of potential germplasm for breeding purpose.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suggested : Response of Starter Nitrogen and Phosphorus Fertilizer Rates to Nodulation, Nitrogen Fixation, and Net Nitrogen Balance on Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.) in the Semi-Arid Tigray Region of Ethiopia	
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.	Please avoid the repetition: Three nitrogen levels (0, 15, and 30 kg N ha ⁻¹) and four phosphorus levels (0, 23, 46, and 69 kg P ₂ O ₅ ha ⁻¹) were included in the field study. The three times replicated treatments of three nitrogen levels (0, 15 and 30 kg N ha ⁻¹) and four phosphorus levels (0, 23, 46 and 69 kg P ₂ O ₅ ha ⁻¹) were arranged in a factorial combination using a randomized complete block design (RCBD)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript looks appropriate, but please fallow the journal guidelines while writing the subsections. Please add the missing information, as: acknowledgements and funding sources, ethical approval, competing interests, etc. in the article.	
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.	Yes, it is scientifically correct, but needs some minor correction/revision on it.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient, but need to replace some references (old references) with current references/publications, if possible. Please fallow the journal guidelines/format while referencing.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It need some improvement.	
Optional/General comments	It looks ok. There is a need to add some more information in discussion part of the manuscript. Please, follow the referencing style of the journal. References style should be consistent. Also, revisit the manuscript and made necessary correction for improving the sentences. Please fallow the journal guidelines/format.	

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:	Anil Pokhrel
Department, University & Country	Nepal