

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120529
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF PLANT GEOMETRY AND INTEGRATED NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF KALMEGH (ANDROGRAPHIS PANICULATA NEES.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community for several reasons. Firstly, it investigates the cultivation of kalmegh, a medicinal plant with increasing demand. By optimizing the growth and yield of kalmegh, this study can contribute to ensuring a sufficient supply of this important medicinal resource. Secondly, the research examines the effects of both plant geometry and integrated nutrient management. This combined approach provides valuable insights into optimizing kalmegh cultivation practices, potentially leading to increased production efficiency and sustainability.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, " is suitable, but it could be improved for clarity and conciseness. for example: Optimizing Kalmegh (Andrographis paniculata Nees.) Cultivation through Plant Spacing and Nutrient Management (This title emphasizes the practical application of the research)</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article appears to be comprehensive, but a minor addition could be beneficial.</p> <p>While the abstract mentions "vermicompost" as part of the optimal fertilizer combination, it doesn't explicitly state its benefit compared to solely inorganic fertilizers.</p> <p>Here's a suggestion for a minor addition:</p> <p>Original: "...and receiving a combination of 50% recommended dose of inorganic fertilizer and 50% vermicompost equivalent to recommended nitrogen..."</p> <p>Improved: "...and receiving a combination of 50% recommended dose of inorganic fertilizer and 50% vermicompost (potentially offering benefits like improved soil health or sustainability) equivalent to recommended nitrogen..."</p> <p>This addition clarifies the nature of vermicompost and suggests a potential benefit it offers compared to inorganic fertilizers alone.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate based on the information provided</p>	
<p>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>I can't assess the scientific correctness of the entire manuscript without directly reviewing it. However, based on the abstract and the information you've provided, the manuscript shows signs of scientific robustness and technical soundness for the following reasons:</p> <p>Split-plot design: The use of a split-plot design suggests a well-controlled experiment where researchers can isolate the effects of plant spacing while accounting for potential block variations.</p> <p>Replication: If the abstract mentions replicates for each treatment combination, it strengthens the reliability of the findings by reducing the chance of random errors influencing the results.</p> <p>Statistical analysis: Statistical analysis is likely applied to the data (though not explicitly mentioned), ensuring the observed effects between treatments are</p>	

Review Form 3

	statistically significant and not due to chance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	It's difficult to definitively determine the sufficiency and recency of the references without reviewing the entire manuscript. However, based on the abstract and the information provided, here's an analysis of the references: The abstract cites references from 2018 to 2023, which indicates the authors incorporated relatively recent research. The field of kalmegh (<i>Andrographis paniculata</i>) cultivation might be a niche area, and the provided reference range (2010-2023) could be appropriate for this specific topic.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Based on the information you've provided about the abstract and overall structure, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	Based on about the manuscript, it appears to be a well-structured and informative piece of research on optimizing kalmegh cultivation.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Reza Rahmatollahi
Department, University & Country	Atatürk University, Türkiye