

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_129048
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Organic Inputs (Jeevamruth and Beejamruth) on Quality Parameters of Fenugreek
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.	Good job, however, there were a lot of factors to determine, such as oil percentage in seeds, number of seeds per plant, and some other growth characteristics, to examine how these organic substances affected the plant and seed quality.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Good title	
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.	Abstract needs more details	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically good work, however much more analysis is needed to fully investigate the use of organic matter.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References were out of date, researcher had to update most of references in introduction and discussion sections	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good language	
Optional/General comments	No ethical issues PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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:	Mona Fekry Ghazal
Department, University & Country	Agriculture Research Center, Egypt