

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>

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.	Nitrogen is considered as an essential element of bio-molecules such as amino acids, proteins, nucleic acids, phyto hormones and a number of enzymes and coenzymes. Nitrogen strongly stimulates growth, expansion of the crop canopy and interception of solar radiation. So that there is need to understand the optimum dose and time of nitrogen application.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is not reflecting the main ideas of the article so need to change as " Quantifying response of sesame (Sesamum indicum L.) to dose and time of nitrogen application under irrigated condition ".	
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 too general and need to improve as per suggestion in manuscript. Comprehensive, but I suggested in effective and scientific way in manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	ok	
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.	<p>Title: The title is not reflecting the main ideas of the article.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract not clearly presents objects, methods and results. Whereas, the abstract is too general and need to improve as per suggestion.</p> <p>Literature review: its ok and recent also but need some extra strong references.</p> <p>Research methods: The research study methods are general and not clearly explain the treatment details. somewhere in results are not justify clearly.</p> <p>Figures: need some figures for paper quality.</p> <p>Tables: OK but I suggested some correction.</p> <p>language efficiency: not so effective and scientific, article writing so poorly.</p> <p>Innovation points and structural logic: its ok,</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.-	References are recent but are not sufficient. Whereas supporting reference are also few need some extra supporting reference.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language/English quality of the article is not to good for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	1.The title is not reflecting the main ideas of the article 2.Methodology not clear and confusing 3.Research methodology are general and not clearly explain the treatment details 4. data of sesame area, production is too old. 5. result not clearly and scientifically write as well as justification of result also not satisfying. 6. supporting reference are also few. 7. need some correction in table. 8. conclusion of study not write as expected from three years of research work.	

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:	Yasir Ajeej Tamboli
Department, University & Country	Jaipur National University, India