Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Engineering Research and Reports**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JERR_107927**
Title of the Manuscript:	**An assessment of the elemental compositions of neem (Azadirachta indica A. Juss) products for biofertilizer production**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	1. Yes, it is important for scientific community. The researchers explored neem leaves, bark, and a mixture of the two as potential biofertilizers and assessed the elemental compositions of these neem components to identify the most suitable material for biofertilizer production. Neem leaves showed significant biofertilizer potential due to their rich nutritional elements. 2. The title is good. 3. The manuscript's abstract lacks information about the materials and methods (M&M) of the research. The author should add a few sentences to address this. 4. The manuscript's structure is generally good but could be improved. The Materials and Methods (M&M) section should provide more detailed information, including an explanation for the choice of settings in the sample sourcing and preparation subsection. While the primary focus of the study is elemental composition analysis, there is currently insufficient information provided. The Results and Discussion (R&D) section lacks in-depth discussion. The author should consider adding a separate discussion section or expanding the discussion within the R&D section. Additionally, a sentence just above Table 2 appears irrelevant to this manuscript. 5. Due to the absence of an elemental composition analysis procedure, the manuscript lacks scientific correctness. In the abstract, the author used the phrases 'the most suitable' and 'the highest,' which may not be entirely accurate. 6. Yes **Additional comment:** Several other issues are apparent in the manuscript. Firstly, the research gap is not correctly mentioned. One of the cited papers (Devi and Gogoi, 2023) has previously worked with neem bark. Additionally, the research objective should be discussed in detail at the end of the introduction section. I do not agree with the argument that 'there was no statistically significant difference between the samples at $p > 0.05$. This suggests that any of the samples can serve as a good source for biofertilizer production.' It seems that the number of samples and replications (which was not mentioned in the manuscript) may not have been sufficient. There are also a few word choices (such as 'level of significance') and grammatical errors that need correction.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Mosammat Mustari Khanaum**
Department, University & Country	**North Dakota State University, USA**