

Reviewers Guide

PART A: Reviewer Only

SECTION I: Comments per Section of Manuscript

General comment:	The research proposal and the main goal of this article are not clear. In addition, there are many scientific gaps in this study. For this reason, unfortunately I suggest that the present manuscript may be considered for publication after revision. The main grounds for rejection are as follows: 1. The manuscript is not written sound and it cannot be read nicely. There are a lot of opportunities to improve the text. It should have been carefully reviewed by a native English speaking scientist before submission. 2. Line no 11 it should be Randomized Block Design (RBD) 2. Previous data or references supporting its scientific hypothesis were not appropriately presented and discussed. 3. The criterion for selection of bean fields and the sampling strategy are not properly presented and supported. 4. Data collection and statistical analysis were handled and discussed poorly. 5. The effective impact of the paper results is lack and was not fully presented and discussed by the authors. 6. The manuscript is not suitable for giving details of new models or hypotheses, innovative methods, techniques or apparatus. 7. in the discussion part, author should discuss properly and take the recent references and discuss their views for the supporting of the respected proposal.
Introduction:	The proposal and the main goal of the paper were not appropriately presented and discussed.
Methodology:	Requires some minor corrections.

Results:	Some parts of results are not clear. Requires more information. You did not specify which aspect of the results though I have followed the suggestions of the two other reviewers in the revised copy.
Discussion:	The references are old. For supporting the proposal incorporate the recent references and discuss briefly. This is true but that does not mean that it cannot be used, take for example Available P was measured by Bray P1 sitting Bray and Kurtz 1945. You cannot say because a reference is old and try to improvise. These are the original owner of the work.

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:	Incorporate recent references in relation to your proposal. . I strongly recommend consulting and citing most updated references. Author should follow the Journals approved format. Some journals name is in italic and some are not, some references publication year are in bracket and some are not. Not in all cases were references old, also journal approved format has been followed
Others:	Moderate revision is required.
Decision:	Accept after moderate revision