

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_128656
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF SOYBEAN (Glycine max L.) TO POTASSIUM FERTILIZER UNDER DIFFERENT CROP GEOMETRY
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript "RESPONSE OF SOYBEAN (Glycine max L.) TO POTASSIUM FERTILIZER UNDER DIFFERENT CROP GEOMETRY" represents an interesting contribution in the areas of crop management and nutrient management, especially in the specific area mentioned above for higher and quality production. However, it needs to pass major revision before being accepted for publication	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is suitable	
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.	Delete the portion which is mentioned in the abstract and make it short focus on main results found in the experiment.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It needs serious major revision for acceptance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I am not English language professional.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have given necessary changes and comments in the manuscript through track changes • Revised the results and write according to the parameter taken in the research rather than treatment • In the introduction section, for better understanding, sequence of sentences, ideas, and paragraphs should follow up in the introduction section, while the whole introduction was arranged in one paragraph, please divide it at least on three paragraphs. The text needs structural revision to ensure that the ideas unfold in a logical progression and the categorization of methods is consistent and logical. • Please rewrite and arrange the methodology section; it should be clearer and more perfect. • Result and dissection parts are confused because of extraordinary information and explanation, which loss the exact mean objectives of the research. Please be considered about. • The conclusion section was obtained in extraordinary information not according to the research findings. • Further comments and edits are provided in the main manuscript file; please review it. 	

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:	Azizullah Khalili
Department, University & Country	Sayed Jamaluddin Afghani University, Afghanistan