

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_126889
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Growth Rates and Nutrient Uptake in Stevia (Stevia rebaudiana Bertoni) through Integrated Nutrient Management
Type of the Article	Research article

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.	The manuscript has importance w.r.t the agriculture field.	
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 poorly written. There is no significance of work included in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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 is very poorly written. The authors have declared that they have used ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc. which is very wrong and not accepted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are very old. The authors have not included recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language is very poor. There are grammatical errors also.	
Optional/General comments	1) The abstract is poorly written. 2) The methodology is not explained in detail. 3) The discussion section is very poor and not written properly. 4) The conclusion section is poorly written. 5) The authors have not recent references. 6) The English language is very poor and there are grammatical errors. 7) The authors have used ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc. which is very wrong and not accepted at all.	

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:	Aparna Gunjal
Department, University & Country	Dr. D. Y. Patil, Arts, Commerce & Science College, India