

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_126915
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different micronutrients on the growth of turmeric (<i>Curcuma longa</i> L.) cv. Salem produced by pro tray method.
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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

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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turmeric is an important commercial crop which is useful in several ways viz., cooking, medicinal purpose etc. • Most of the farmers using macro nutrients but not micro nutrients. This study is very useful in enhancing the quantity as well quality of the turmeric. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable title but the combination of micro nutrients was not used. 	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abstract is ok as per the document 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sub sections were appropriate 	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear description of growing conditions and location • Precise details on planting spacing and fertilizer applications • Well-defined treatment concentrations and application timing • Comprehensive data tables showing measurements across all time periods • Clear presentation of results for multiple growth parameters • Some formatting inconsistencies in table 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references cited in the manuscript are generally sufficient and included recent studies relevant to the topic. However, to enhance the manuscript's comprehensiveness, it may benefit from the inclusion of a few additional references. • Some references in the text aren't properly cited 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-structured and the scientific terminology is used appropriately. However, there are a few areas where clarity and precision could be improved.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could include yield data since growth parameters don't necessarily correlate with final yield • No economic analysis to determine cost-effectiveness of treatments • No quality parameters of the final product were measured • Soil analysis data before experiment not provided • Weather data during the experiment period not included • No mention of disease/pest management practices 	

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:	Valluru Manju Vani
Department, University & Country	India