

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126768
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of integrated nutrient management with VAM on nutrient uptake and yield of sorghum
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>

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>
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.	It enhances nutrient efficiency and yield through INM with VAM. It can promote sustainable agricultural practices, decrease reliance on chemical fertilizers, and improve soil health, providing valuable knowledge for boosting crop productivity in an eco-friendly manner.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The abstract is concise, but the authors should include a brief statement of the study's objective to enhance clarity, as the current word count is quite low and could be expanded to at least 150 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The manuscript employs a systematic approach with well-designed experiments to assess the impact of INM with VAM on nutrient uptake and yield in sorghum. Its methodology, aligned with established soil microbiology principles, ensures reliable results, making the findings credible and relevant to current agricultural research practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript lack consistency in formatting, with variations in author names, journal titles, issue numbers, and page numbers. As a reviewer, I suggest that the authors follow a standard citation style, such as APA, Harvard, or the journal's preferred format, to ensure uniformity. Additionally, while some recent references are included, many are outdated, with some dating back to the 1980s. To strengthen the manuscript's scientific relevance, the authors should consider incorporating more recent studies from the past 5–10 years, particularly in the areas of integrated nutrient management (INM) and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizal (VAM) applications.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	<p>Line 9, 45 - Change "Kharif" to <i>Kharif</i> (in italics). Line 10 - Format "(5 kg ha-1)" with "ha-1" in superscript as "(5 kg ha⁻¹)". Lines 13, 14 - Use keywords that do not repeat the exact words in the title for more diversity. Lines 37, 79, 80 - Arrange references in chronological or alphabetical order, prioritizing recent references, like Singh (2019). Line 42 - Limit AI-generated content to an appropriate level. Lines 48, 66 - Change "intial" to "initial" Line 49 - Use "Table 1" instead of "Table no. 1". Line 66 - Remove the bold formatting for Table 1's serial number. Line 80 - Remove the closing parenthesis after Singh (2019) and replace the period with a semicolon. Line 101 - Ensure consistency by aligning "Table 2" with "Table 1" (Line 49) formatting. Table 2 - Remove the dot after "***".</p>	

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:	Madhavan Gnanasekaran
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India