

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_117464
Title of the Manuscript:	ENHANCING THE OILSEED CROPS THROUGH MICRONUTRIENT FERTILIZATION
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript has been written in a format similar to review of literature in thesis. The author needs to go through the format of the manuscript to suit a review article. Efforts have to be taken to add more papers and mention in detail the reasons for the results obtained.</p> <p>The alternative title can be "Enhancement of oilseeds crop production through micronutrient fertilization: A review"</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Need few corrections</p> <p>As this is a review based on previous studies it can be considered as correct</p> <p>The number and variation in the collected article can be improved. Latest references need to added.</p> <p>If there are papers with similar treatments or results try to sum up it in a one or two lines by combining references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article can be accepted after carrying out the corrections mentioned and if needed can be sent for one more review to alternate author for quality improvement	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M Vinutha
Department, University & Country	TNAU, India