

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128300
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the effect of phosphorus, molybdenum and Rhizobium inoculation on growth, yield attributes characters and yield of greengram (Vigna radiata L.) in loamy sand
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>

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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community, particularly for researchers, agronomists and policymakers focused on sustainable agriculture and pulse production. It provides critical insights into the combined effects of phosphorus, molybdenum and Rhizobium inoculation on nodulation, growth, yield attributes, seed and stover yields of greengram (Vigna radiata L.) in loamy sand soils. The findings offer practical guidance for optimizing nutrient management strategies, thereby improving productivity, soil health and economic returns. The results support the efficient use of soil amendments and biofertilizers, promoting environmentally sustainable and resource-efficient agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Assessing the effect of phosphorus, molybdenum and Rhizobium inoculation on growth, yield attributes characters and yield of greengram (Vigna radiata L.) in loamy sand" is clear and informative. However, it can be made more concise and impactful. A suggested alternative title could be: "Interactive Effects of Phosphorus, Molybdenum, and Rhizobium Inoculation on Growth, Nodulation and Yield of Greengram (Vigna radiata L.) in Loamy Sand"	

Review Form 3

<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 and effectively summarizes the key aspects of the study, including the objective, methodology and significant findings. It could be improved by emphasizing the quantitative results for key metrics such as seed yield, stover yield and nodule development. Including the percentage increase in seed yield and nodulation due to the combined application of 40 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹, 0.5 kg Mo ha⁻¹ and Rhizobium inoculation would make the abstract more impactful and data-driven.</p> <p>Suggested Addition: Include quantitative data, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percentage increase in seed yield (e.g., "40 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ increased seed yield by 16.55% in pooled data"). • Highlight that the combined application of 40 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹, 0.5 kg Mo ha⁻¹, and Rhizobium inoculation was most beneficial for GM 4 greengram variety. 	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically accurate and methodologically sound. The use of a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with a factorial concept is appropriate for evaluating the combined effects of phosphorus, molybdenum and Rhizobium inoculation. The statistical analysis, use of S.E.m. and coefficient of variation (C.V.) are correctly applied. The results align with established knowledge in the field of leguminous crop production and the findings are supported by references to previous studies. Care should be taken to ensure the clarity of certain data points in the discussion, particularly where the results are "at par" with certain treatments. Clear justification and elaboration on these findings would enhance the manuscript's scientific rigor.</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 manuscript includes relevant references to earlier works, such as Rabbani et al. (2005), Yadav et al. (2007) and Rani et al. (2016). Some references may be slightly dated. To enhance the robustness of the literature review, the authors could consider incorporating more recent studies from 2018–2024 that focus on phosphorus, molybdenum and biofertilizer inoculation impacts on leguminous crops. This would strengthen the manuscript's relevance in the context of modern agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the manuscript is understandable but could be improved for clarity and readability. Some grammatical errors, typographical issues and repetitive language should be corrected. Certain sentences, such as those involving "at par" comparisons, could be rephrased for better readability and flow. Proofreading the manuscript with a focus on grammar, sentence structure and conciseness would enhance its overall readability and scholarly presentation.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology is clear, but a flowchart or diagram summarizing the experimental design and treatment layout could improve reader understanding. • Discussion and conclusion sections should emphasize the practical implications of the findings, particularly in the context of sustainable agriculture, resource efficiency and pulse production. • The manuscript has significant practical importance and the results may serve as a reference point for nutrient management in similar agro-climatic conditions. <p>There are no competing interest issues evident in this manuscript. The authors have not declared any conflicts of interest nor are there any indications of financial, personal or institutional biases affecting the outcomes of the study. The results are presented objectively and the conclusions are supported by the data. If applicable, it may be useful for the authors to provide a formal statement regarding the absence of competing interests.</p> <p>No competing interest issues are evident.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pooja S Beleri
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India