



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_27759
Title of the Manuscript:	Dynamics of nitrogen on soyabean field amended with poultry manure
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>)



SDI 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	The research article deserves publication but requires minor revision. In abstract section, 2 nd last sentence is too long and needs to be fragmented. Also, discussion section is very poor and needs to be rewritten. In discussion, authors have mentioned the findings of their proposal. It needs to be discussed compared to available literature.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	As stated in compulsory comments. I have my suggestions for two corrections. 1. 2 nd last sentence of abstract is too long and needs to be fragmented. 2. Discussion section represents the findings only and need to be rewritten in terms of available literature correlating their findings.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research article is technically sound is of significant value for sustainable practices.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kaushal Kishore Choudhary</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Botany, Dr Jagannath Mishra College, Muzaffarpur, Bihar, India</i>