

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_124275
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of irrigation and nitrogen management on summer sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript on irrigation and nitrogen management in summer sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.) is important for agriculture as it explores ways to improve crop yield and sustainability. By studying how different irrigation methods and nitrogen use affect sesame growth, the research offers useful guidelines for farmers. With the growing demand for oilseeds and the challenges of climate change, this study helps enhance resilience in sesame farming. I find this manuscript valuable for its practical insights that could influence future agricultural practices and policies.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Suitable</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract gives a good overview of the study's aim, methods, results, and conclusions about irrigation and nitrogen management in summer sesame. To improve it, adding a sentence about the specific goals of the experiment would help provide context. Also, mentioning why the findings are important for farming practices would strengthen the conclusion. Overall, it summarizes the main points well, but a bit more detail on objectives and implications would make it even better</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The manuscript presents a clear and thorough study on how irrigation and nutrient management affect sesame growth and yield. Using a split plot design and detailed soil analysis, along with solid statistical methods like ANOVA, strengthens the findings. The consistent improvements in growth and yield across different treatments highlight the reliability of the results. Overall, this research offers valuable insights for optimizing sesame cultivation, making it useful for agricultural scientists and practitioners.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references provided appear to be a solid mix of studies relevant to sesame (<i>Sesamum indicum</i> L.) research, covering various aspects like irrigation, nitrogen management, and integrated nutrient management. However, while some references are relatively recent, others date back several years, with the oldest being from 2001. For a more comprehensive and current literature review, it would be beneficial to include additional recent studies from the last three years that focus on similar topics, particularly those published in high-impact journals.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language in the manuscript is mostly appropriate for scholarly communication, but some parts could be clearer and more concise. While the technical terms are suitable for the audience, some sentences are too long and could be simplified. Consistent formatting and clearer data presentation would also improve readability. Overall, the manuscript is scientifically strong, but better language and flow would make it easier for a broader audience to understand</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is well-structured and covers important topics, but it could be clearer and easier to read. Simplifying the language, updating references with recent studies, and improving the flow between sections would enhance its overall quality and accessibility for readers.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Rakesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	SKUAST, India