

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125773
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of iron and zinc fertilization on growth and yield of mustard (brassica juncea l.) In loamy sand
Type of the Article	Research

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community, particularly for those researching sustainable agriculture and nutrient management. It provides actionable insights on how micronutrients, like iron and zinc, can enhance mustard growth and yield, which is essential for improving food security and supporting smallholder farmers in regions with nutrient-deficient soils. The findings can help bridge the gap between scientific research and practical farming applications, especially in rainfed areas where resource constraints are a major challenge. Personally, I appreciate the manuscript's practical relevance and the clear way it outlines the impact of these treatments, making it highly applicable for fieldwork.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and directly reflects the content of the manuscript. However, to make it more impactful, a slight tweak could be: <i>"Optimizing Iron and Zinc Fertilization for Enhanced Mustard Yield in Loamy Sand: A Field Study."</i> This would emphasize the optimization aspect and practical outcomes.	
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 provides a good overview but could benefit from a stronger emphasis on the key statistical outcomes. For instance, mentioning the percentage increase in yield or other significant results would add clarity. I'd also suggest including a brief statement on the practical recommendation for farmers, which would make the abstract more informative for readers.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is well-organized, with logical flow between sections. The methods are clearly defined, and the results are easy to follow. Overall, the manuscript has a solid framework that guides the reader through the research without unnecessary complexity.	
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 research appears scientifically robust, with sound methodology and appropriate replication. The authors have employed a well-designed randomized block experiment, which adds reliability to their findings. The data is analyzed using proper statistical methods, and the conclusions drawn align with the results. It's evident that the authors have a strong grasp of the subject, and the work is technically well-grounded.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are generally adequate, though a few more recent citations from 2023 or late 2022 could be added to strengthen the background. If possible, incorporating some global studies on micronutrient fertilization could broaden the manuscript's appeal.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is mostly clear, though there are some minor grammatical improvements that could be made. A quick round of proofreading for sentence flow and clarity, especially in the introduction and results sections, would make the manuscript more polished.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction covers a lot of historical ground, but it could be tightened to focus more on recent developments in micronutrient fertilization. 2. The practical application of the findings is well-addressed; however, a little more discussion on how these results could be implemented on a larger scale would be helpful. 3. In the abstract, it would be useful to include more specific numbers or percentages to quantify the benefits of the treatments. 4. Visual aids, such as graphs or charts, could enhance the presentation of the results and make the data more accessible. 5. The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit comparison of soil conditions in the experimental field versus those in typical mustard-growing regions. 6. The conclusions could more strongly emphasize the broader implications for farming practices in other crop systems. 7. Some abbreviations are introduced without being defined (e.g., DAS). Defining these terms upfront would improve readability. 8. Clarify the rationale for choosing soil and foliar applications—why were these methods selected for this study? 9. Adding suggestions for future research based on the study's findings would strengthen the manuscript. 10. A brief discussion on potential environmental impacts (e.g., fertilizer runoff) would be a nice addition. 11. Evaluating the cost-effectiveness of foliar versus soil applications for farmers could add practical value to the study. 12. It would be helpful to discuss the sample size in terms of the statistical power of the study. 13. Include a section discussing the economic feasibility of these treatments for smallholder farmers. 14. Consistency in reporting units is important—ensure all yield and nutrient concentrations are reported uniformly. 15. Consider more descriptive table headings that outline the specific treatments being compared. 16. More regional context could be added—how do these results compare to mustard yields in other parts of India? 17. Including a brief section on how climate conditions might have affected the results would be useful. 18. If there were any challenges faced during the fieldwork, these could be discussed to provide context for the results. 19. Although this study focuses on loamy sand, it would be beneficial to discuss how these results might transfer to different soil types. 20. A final proofread to catch minor grammatical errors would ensure the manuscript reads smoothly. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kapil Prasad Marasini
Department, University & Country	HICAST, Nepal