

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Microbiology Research Journal International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_125325
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of irrigation scheduling on nutrient uptake and soil microorganisms in linseed ( <i>Linum usitatissimum</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights the critical role of irrigation scheduling in enhancing nutrient uptake and soil microbial health in linseed cultivation. Its findings provide practical insights for sustainable agricultural practices, promoting better water management strategies. I appreciate the rigorous methodology and the relevance of the results, which can significantly inform future research and farming practices.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is suitable. May also use "Optimizing Irrigation Scheduling to Enhance Nutrient Uptake and Soil Microbial Activity in Linseed Cultivation"</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive but for more clarity and completeness, I will suggest the following additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective Clarification: Explicitly state the primary research question or hypothesis at the beginning to provide context.</li> <li>2. Methodological Details: Briefly mention the experimental design (e.g., randomized complete block design) to give readers insight into the study's rigor.</li> <li>3. Key Results Summary: Include specific numerical results or percentages to quantify the improvements in nutrient uptake and microbial populations, making the findings more impactful.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate.</p> <p>May consider the following suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results and Discussion Separation: Consider separating the results and discussion sections to allow for a more focused presentation of findings followed by an interpretation of those results.</li> <li>2. Conclusion Section: A distinct conclusion section summarizing the key findings and their implications could strengthen the manuscript's impact.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust due to its clear research objectives and systematic methodology, including the use of a randomized complete block design. This approach ensures reliable and valid results, minimizing bias. The comprehensive analysis of soil microbial populations and enzymatic activities in response to irrigation treatments further strengthens the study, providing valuable insights into the relationship between water management and soil health. Overall, the quantitative data presented enhances the technical soundness of the research.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to be a mix of both recent and older studies. However, to enhance the manuscript's credibility and relevance, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies, particularly those published within the last five years.</p> <p>Particularly on Irrigation and soil health, Microbial Dynamics and Nutrient uptake.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, it appears suitable for scholarly communication.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### **PART 2:**

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

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Saransh Kumar Gautam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, India</b>