

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_125643
Title of the Manuscript:	The Impact of Integrated Nutrient Management Practices on Land Productivity, Crop Residue Decomposition and Abundance of Soil Organisms in a Banana Plantation in Sri Lanka
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 paper is a welcome step towards elucidating and quantifying the impact of integrated nutrient management practices on land productivity, crop residue decomposition and abundance of soil organisms in a Banana Plantation in Sri Lanka. It is an important work in that it provides management practices which will help in improving the organic carbon levels as well as the overall fertility of the soil. This will help in improving agricultural productivity in marginal lands of Sri Lanka, thereby alleviating malnutrition as emphasised by the authors. Moreover, such studies are often limited in communities that do not have capital for synthetic fertiliser purchases. It is indeed an eye-opening work.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and captures the content of the manuscript.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. I suggest that the authors add the research gap in their abstract. I would like to know what is not known and the contribution of their work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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 scientifically robust and technically correct in that the authors were able to outline their methodology well. They have adopted a comprehensive methodology with sound experimental design and treatments. Moreover, they have used correct statistical methods to test the significance of their results. Hence, their work can be reproduced by other authors.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are minor revisions which are still required to improve the overall readability of the manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Seome Michael Swafo
Department, University & Country	University of Limpopo, South Africa