

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_83581
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Nitrogen and Phosphorus fertilizer on yield, yield component and quality of faba bean (Vicia faba L.) varieties at Arsi Zone, Oromia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p><u>At the level of your abstract</u>, you may gainfully start by presenting the aim of your research.</p> <p><u>A the level of the introduction</u></p> <p>The introduction needs to be properly built; be careful with the problematic; it is the core of the introduction. You can simply go from a general situation enclosing the problem you are trying to solve; from there, you develop your problematic; at the end, you announce your scientific contribution. However, what did you noticed about nitrogen and phosphorus in beans nutrition and that justified your work (antagonism in a given soil context? Equilibrium between the two nutrients?...)? Precise it please; it is a scientific work to be used worldwide. Some misspellings are present. Many sentences need to be rephrased.</p> <p>From the paragraph announced in brackets (This could be mainly due to poor soil fertility, as it is cultivated.....), it seems as you are interpreting some results; change that please.</p> <p><u>Material and methods</u> : the different paragraphs need to be rephrased</p> <p><u>Results and discussion</u></p> <p>3.1. Faba bean agronomic parameter and yield components</p> <p>The major agronomic parameters such as plant height, number of pod per plant, number of seeds per pod, spike per 0.5 m, 1000 grain weight, grain yield, Biomass yield and harvest index were measured for this study: this can't be considered as a section</p> <p>Be careful with the use of parenthesis (e.g: 3.2. Plant height (cm)), especially here:</p> <p>The plant height of faba bean affected by application of three levels of fertilizer and varieties was presented in (Table 1)).</p> <p>What means this please: photosynthat???? (section 3.6)</p> <p>Apart from the existence of the 3.1 strange section, the way this part of the manuscript is organized is good. However, rephrasing the entire manuscript for me seems to be compulsory. In fact, as announced above according to the way the abstract is written, it can be easily found that the present manuscript is facing real problems related with punctuations and the structuring of sentences, making at certain time the understanding of the manuscript really difficult unfortunately. For instance, go through the 3.7 section. In other words, The results and discussion part of a manuscript represents the contribution of the author in the improvement of the scientific knowledge in a given field. You have pertinent results. However, the way they are presented is really questionable. I suggest you to reorganize them, properly discuss and interpret them.</p> <p>Moreover, I don't think that the name of the authors cited must appear in the text; the use of numbers can be done for that purpose. Then in the references, those numbers can be respectively associated with the author indexed. This will have the advantage to lighten the manuscript. In the same vein, the following situation could be avoided: Shroff. C???, (2003)</p> <p>There are many abbreviations; precise their meaning could be useful.</p> <p>Your introduction seems to reveal the low chemical fertility of soils on which the experiments were done. It constitutes then an opening for me to tell you that I would have like to see the physic-chemical analysis of those soils before and after the</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>treatments. This could have made your discussion denser and your general results more relevant.</p> <p>I finally have the impression that the present manuscript was written with too much precipitation. I advice the author to come down and reconsider it deeply because the results he obtained are interesting according to my way of seeing things.</p> <p>Why not simply conclusion instead of Summary and conclusion??????</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The results presented here are interesting.</p>	
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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fopoussi Tuebue Jean Christophe
Department, University & Country	Jesus and Mary Secondary High School, Cameroon