

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
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.	I don't think the level of this research is of great importance to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	This title is inappropriate as it refers to quality standards that the researchers did not achieve the minimum, and I believe that it is not worthy of review.	
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, it is sufficient for the superficial results obtained by the researcher or researchers.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No, the manuscript contains many scientific notes, the most important of which are: It relied on only two characteristics (protein and chlorophyll) and in the growth stages, and these indicators are not completely sufficient to achieve the great goals that the researcher referred to in the title and the goals of this study. There is a clear error in mentioning the details of the work, the date of planting, the period of conducting this study, and other notes in the materials and methods	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Somewhat	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>PLEASE CHECK ATTACHMENT</b>	

#### 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:	Saddam Hakeem Cheyed
Department, University & Country	College of Agriculture Engineering Sciences University of Baghdad, Iraq