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	

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: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. **Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript?**	Yes, important for scientific community. Yes, like	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes	
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.	The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-written and well-organized. The subsections are clear and concise, and the structure of the manuscript follows a standard scientific paper format.	
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.	Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a standard scientific paper format, the results are presented clearly and objectively, and the conclusions are supported by the data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes, the language is suitable for scientific communication.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**Ravi Kumar Rajak**
Department, University & Country	**Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology, India**