

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_126918
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen and boron fertilization on nutrient content and uptake by Mustard crop in Chitrakoot area
Type of the Article	Research 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is significantly importance for several reasons, particularly in the context of agricultural sustainability, improving crop productivity, and addressing nutrient deficiencies in semi-arid regions like Chitrakoot. This kind of research helps fill knowledge gaps and can lead to new recommendations for farmers and agricultural extension services. It could also lead to further research on optimizing nutrient management practices in other crops and regions with similar challenges. Furthermore, the focus on a semi-arid region adds particular relevance to the study, as such areas face unique agricultural challenges that demand innovative and region-specific solutions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes. It is almost correct.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, it is comprehensive. But language can be changed. One or two points may be added on the relevance of this topic as well as the specific region.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes. It is almost correct.	
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound because this study clearly defines the objective and it follows a well-structured experimental design, methodology, and application of modern technologies such as nano-urea. The clear research objectives, well-planned treatments, thorough data collection, and comprehensive analysis make it a valuable contribution to the field of agricultural science. The study's practical relevance to farmers in semi-arid regions, combined with its focus on sustainable and efficient fertilization practices, underscores its importance both scientifically and in terms of real-world application.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	References should be recent years. It seems that most of the references are old. So, authors should use references from recent year	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language/English quality of the article should be improved. There are few grammatical mistakes were found	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound</li><li>2. The discussion part is not sufficient.</li><li>3. The authors should use references from recent year</li></ol>	

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arunima Gogoi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Assam Agricultural University (AAU), India</b>