



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_48688
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Phosphorus Fertilizer Rates on Yield and Yield Components of Faba Bean (Vicia faba L.) Varieties in Lemu Bilbilo District of Arsi Zone, Southeastern Ethiopia
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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	Reviewed article gives interesting results concerning the effect of varieties and different doses of phosphorus on yield and yield components of faba bean. The experiment was correctly planned and carried out. Manuscript is generally well written, but after reading, some comments and suggestions arise: 1. In the abstract, abbreviations should not be used, e.g. TSP 2. In my opinion, in the titles of sub-chapters, it is better to use the term 'Number of Pods per Plant' instead 'Number of Pods Plant ⁻¹ ' 3. I did not find a citation in the text of some of the items given in the References, number 12, 18, 21, 27, 28, 33, 35. The authors should check and correct it 4. References are not given in accordance with the recommendations for authors. This must be corrected 5. In the presented experiment the authors obtained a very high yield of faba bean seeds. They state that the average yield in production is 2.1 t per hectare, and in the research they obtained as much as 6 ton. Is the yield certainly well reported? If so, they should comment. This aspect has been completely omitted	We agreed with the reviewer's comment and accordingly corrected all commented issues of the manuscript based on the comment. Regarding the yield, it was certainly well reported and all step wise data were carefully conducted, but, the reason why it is much different may be because the reviewed yield result was the national average report but, the yield obtained in this presented experiment is obtained under managed experimental field and the study area is potential area also with favourable for faba bean production.
Minor REVISION comments	There are minor editorial errors in the text of the work. Fragments requiring improvement have been marked.	Corrected based on the comment given
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)	