

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_129160
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Rhizobium strains on Urdbean productivity
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.	Researcher draft Manuscripts is helpful for scientific community as well as general population. This is beneficial research for <i>Rhizobium</i> application in field. This contributes to our understanding of how <i>Rhizobium</i> fixes nitrogen in legumes crop and benefits our soils.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes title of the article is suitable. It is informative, succinct, and straight forward. It faithfully conveys the paper's main idea	
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.	Yes Abstract comprehensive. No need of addition or deletion. It gives a clear summary of the study's methodology, findings, research question, and implications. Additionally, the abstract is clear and well-written.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Almost manuscript is correct required little bit corrections. The results are presented clearly and succinctly, and the approach is sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes references are sufficient and recent. The writers reference numerous pertinent sources, such as current rhizobium research publications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes article suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is interesting and well-written overall, in my opinion. It significantly advances the subject of sentiment analysis, and a variety of scholars are likely to find it interesting.	

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:	Satyam
Department, University & Country	Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidhyapeeth Rahuri, India