

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121710
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Liquid Biofertilizer With or Without Vermicompost on Growth and Yield of Field Pea (Pisum sativum) Grown Under Laterite Soil of West Bengal
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.	This manuscript contributes significantly to the understanding of sustainable agricultural practices, particularly in the context of laterite soils. The study investigates the combined effects of liquid biofertilizers and vermicompost on the growth and yield of field pea, a crop of high nutritional and economic value. By providing empirical evidence on the benefits of integrating organic and inorganic fertilizers, this research supports the advancement of environmentally friendly farming methods. This is crucial for promoting sustainable agriculture and reducing dependence on chemical fertilizers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, The title is appropriate as it clearly reflects the content and scope of the study.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a concise overview of the study's objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. However, mentioning the statistical methods used and the key numerical results would enhance clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is well-organized, with clear subsections for introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is well thought out, employing a factorial randomized block design that allows for comprehensive analysis of the interactions between treatments. The use of appropriate statistical methods to analyze the data lends credibility to the findings. The results are discussed in the context of existing literature, providing a solid scientific foundation for the conclusions drawn.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and cover relevant studies related to biofertilizers, vermicompost, and field pea cultivation. However, the inclusion of more recent studies, especially those published in the last five years, would strengthen the manuscript by ensuring that it reflects the latest advancements in the field.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language quality of the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Ismarley Lage Horta Morais
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Uberlândia, Brazil