

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120317
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of Inorganic, Integrated and Organic Sources of Nutrients on Growth and Yield of Cabbage
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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 of 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>The manuscript provides significant findings relevant to sustainable agriculture, especially in the context of integrated nutrient management. It demonstrates that a combination of inorganic and organic nutrients can enhance cabbage yield while maintaining soil health. This research is crucial for promoting environmentally friendly agricultural practices and reducing reliance on chemical fertilizers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's content and scope.</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 is comprehensive but could benefit from slight restructuring for clarity. Consider emphasizing the key findings and their implications in a more concise manner.</p> <p>Suggested Abstract Improvement: "A field experiment was conducted to evaluate the effects of inorganic integrated and organic nutrient sources on cabbage production. Seven treatments were compared, including various combinations of inorganic fertilizers and organic manures. Results indicated that combining 50% inorganic fertilizers with 50% farmyard manure (FYM) yielded the highest cabbage production. The study highlights the potential for integrated nutrient management to enhance crop yield and soil health."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-organized with clear subsections for Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, and Discussion. This structure facilitates easy comprehension of the research process and findings.</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>The study is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design, including the Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications, ensures the reliability of the results. The detailed methodology for soil and plant analysis further strengthens the validity of the findings. The discussion appropriately interprets the results, drawing on relevant literature to contextualize the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent. They cover a range of relevant studies, supporting the manuscript's findings and providing a solid theoretical foundation.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly clear and suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical errors and typographical mistakes should be addressed to enhance readability.</p> <p>Examples of Language Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "A field experiment was conducted at Nalanda College of Horticulture" can be rephrased to "A field experiment was conducted at the Nalanda College of Horticulture." "The experiment comprised of seven treatments viz." should be "The experiment comprised seven treatments, viz." 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The manuscript could benefit from additional visuals, such as charts or graphs, to illustrate the differences in growth parameters and yields across treatments.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Consider adding a section on the practical implications of the findings for farmers and policymakers.</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. Ebenesar Anna Bagyam
Department, University & Country	Karpagam Academy of Higher Education, India