

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_127502
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancement of sesamum yield with split application of nitrogen under irrigated conditions
Type of the Article	Original 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>

Review Form 3

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.	This study highlights the importance of application of split doses of Nitrogen fertilizer in sesamum in rabi season. The authors claim to have obtained significantly higher plant height, number of capsules per plant and number of seeds per capsule, number of branches per plant and capsule length with the treatment of split doses of nitrogen in 25-37.5-37.5 ratio at basal, 20 and 40 DAS. Therefore, they have claimed that application of 80 kg N ha ⁻¹ in three splits in the ratio of 25-37.5-37.5 at basal, 20 and 40 days after sowing may be recommended for obtaining maximum seed yield in sesamum under irrigated conditions during <i>rabi</i> .	
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.	yes	
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 article is concise point to point. All the sections have been written carefully. The table are placed at appropriate places. The findings include three year of field data. The data is statistically analysed appropriately.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is appropriate. However, the authors should add "acknowledgement" at the end of the manuscript. The author should also include a layout map of the experimental plot in addition to a general view (photograph) of the standing experiment in order to increase the overall quality of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Satisfactory	

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:	Nirbhay Kumar Singh
Department, University & Country	Sardarkrushinagar Dantiwada Agricultural University, India