

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_127065
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Nutrient Management and Mulching on Growth Parameters, Yield Attributes and Yield of Pearl millet [<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br. Emend Stuntz] in Western Region of India
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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Elementary statistical measures such as percentages, mean, figures were computed/illustrated. It has discussed all the concepts in details as required for an explicit presentation of manuscript write-up.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title is too lengthy and ambiguous suggested as: Mulching Effects on Nutrients' Management on Growth Parameters of Pearl millet [<i>Pennisetum glaucum</i> (L.) R. Br. Emend Stuntz] in Western Region of India	
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.	NO! See as corrected, Provide the keywords subsection: (Arrange alphabetically and avoid the use of abbreviations in this section). (Abstract is presented as one paragraph/block always without sub-titles)	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES, but source all the Tables as indicated on manuscript.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Quite SUFFICIENT but POORLY ARRANGED AND PRESENTED NOT ACCORDING TO required STANDARD, REMOVE NUMBERS 1-----23 AND ARRANGE ALPHABETICALLY. I suggest for the use of latest APA FORMAT.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is good and well communicated for clear understanding, BUT remember that, manuscripts/articles are generally presented in past/reported tense).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Author should go over CAREFULLY the manuscript and remove ALL RED colour letters/phrases/sentences, numbers, PERCENTAGE VALUES and ADD ALL BLUE COLOUR accordingly as identified by the Reviewer on the manuscript	

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:	Salisu Audu Baba
Department, University & Country	Nigeria