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

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? 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.	
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.	yes	
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.	
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.	

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.	
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.**	
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:	**Shahira H. EL-Moslamy**
Department, University & Country	**Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute (GEBRI), City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications (SRTA-city), Egypt**