

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_126575
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity Enhancement in Blackgram (Vigna mungo L.) Through Foliar Application of Potassium Salt of Active Phosphorus (PSAP)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work has a strong idea at its basic level. This work was composed as a rough draft. In my opinion, the authors cannot make their current claims without considering their writings.	Thank you, sir/madam, The research work was carried out based on current trending nano and complete water-soluble fertilizers having higher use efficiencies having much benefits in legume research.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	Title has kept same
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	No changes were made
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	There is insufficient information in the article's introduction. The most important aspects (designed goals) are ignored in this work.	Work has been done according to plan of work designed and observations were recorded according plan Growth, crop growth indices, yield components and yield, quality parameters, nutrient uptake and availability and economics has been analyzed
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Definitions of all the key terminology and an extensive survey of the literature must be included in the introduction. Additionally, the methodology section requires additional details that should be organized according to how your job was planned. The procedures employed require additional clarification by describing all of the details with recent references. The statistical analysis isn't supported up by major specific data. Which statistical program was used is unclear in the authors' description Throughout the results, and discussion sections, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated. There are different sections were not written clearly without grammatical or spelling errors. Kindly specify which statistics software version you are employing (in separate section). You should also consider using charts, figures, diagrams with standard deviation bars in your results. Clearly describing the diagram in the findings section is also a smart idea. You should also provide a more detailed description of your decision's targets, including the particular pathway that you planned to implement. Also, the discussion that took place was extremely disorganized and useless.	Changes has made according to reviewer's comments

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The reference list is inadequate and out-of-date.	References were updated, Methodology for analysis has recommended in past so, I had given some past references and only few research works were carried on these products on blackgram and PSAP is new released there so much reviews on this product
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are occasions when this manuscript's language and sentence structures are unintelligible. This article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. Throughout the text, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated.	Grammatical changes were made
Optional/General comments		Thank you sir/madam

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)	