

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_114835
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of different nutrient management strategies for N, P, K uptake and availability in chilli ( <i>Capsicum annum var. annum L.</i> )
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Somehow</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>I would say, there is neither sufficient nor recent references. Better to add more discussion portion as well as add recent references like; Rajendra Bam, Sharoj Raj Mishra, Subodh Khanal, Prakash Ghimire, Suman Bhattarai, Effect of biofertilizers and nutrient sources on the performance of mungbean at Rupandehi, Nepal, Journal of Agriculture and Food Research, Volume 10, 2022, 100404, ISSN 2666-1543, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2022.100404">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2022.100404</a>.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The discussion will provide more information regarding the previous research and your findings so it will be considered. Also, conclusion provides a broad overview without specific quantitative outcomes, limiting its impact. It lacks a clear synthesis of the study's contributions and implications. Acknowledgment, authors' contributions, funding information, and ethics are missing. Recommend <b>minor revisions</b> for a more comprehensive conclusion, inclusion of essential sections, and improved clarity.</p>	

### 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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Rajendra Bam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal</b>