

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JSRR_125347 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impacts of Calotropis and Azadirachta Green Leaf Manure and Bio Decomposer on Growth and Yield of Lentil |
| Type of the Article | |

PART 1: Review Comments

| <u>Compulsory</u> 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> |
|---|--|---|
| 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 study and its findings is important to the scientific community in the context of suggesting Green Leaf Manure (GLM) as an alternative supplementary source of Nitrogen to lentil crop. Use of organic source of manure also contributes to better environment. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The Title is fine. | |
| 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. | I suggest to insert the sentence "Recommendation of this finding would allow lentil farmers to save money which otherwise would be spent on nitrogenous fertilizer." | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | I would be better if the writer puts few sentences on the Implication of the Research findings to the farmers and/ or policy makers. What is take away message for lentil growers. In the methodology section, information on Nitrogen content of GLM is not provided. What is the quantity of GLM (fresh or dry) to apply to get 20% of Recommended dose of Nitrogen (RDN)? | |
| 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 methodology followed is standard, and article has all the elements of the scientific paper such as Abstract, Materials and Methods, soil nutrient analytical procedure and data gathering process and statistical analysis, discussion and conclusion. The article can be published after rectifying the correction as suggested in the comments section in the article. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | References are relevant and adequate. However, this has to be presented in Alphabetical order of Authors. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Some of the sentences in the methodology section has to be rewritten/ rephrased avoiding grammatical mistakes. Correction points have been provided as comments in the manuscript itself. | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | It would have been better to include results of at least two seasons data to account for the effects of seasons on performance of the agronomic trials. | |

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: | Ram Krishna Neupane |
| Department, University & Country | Nepal |