

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_123760
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Customized Fertilizer Formulations on Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) under Sodic soil
Type of the Article	Research article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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)
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.	The study on Customized Fertilizer Formulation applications on growth and yield of Brinjal varieties is an interesting study to know, what type of fertilizer combination can yield best in brinjals at sodic soils. Authors conclude that the treatment T11 i.e. CFF2 (100% macro nutrients as straight fertilizers) +Liquid MN formulation + organics (composted Press mud @ 5 t/ha) was giving higher brinjal fruit yield.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Effect of Customized Fertilizer Formulations on Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) under Sodic soil" is the suitable title.	
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 should be divided into background, method, results and conclusion. In the present manuscript, the abstract is vague and needs to improved. The sentence "No Significant observations in growth yield and yield parameter was recorded ..." dilutes the results of the study. It is better to give the positive results in the abstract. Mention, what was done to improvise the sodicity of the soil and yield of brinjal.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	In materials and method section, only method is given, no mention of materials and their purchase or company details. All other sections are good.	
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.	Authors have planned and executed the study in an organized manner. In the present study they have designed Three levels of CF I CF II and CF III viz., 75%, 100% and 125% of CFF and were compared with 100% RDF through straight fertilizers. The scientific approach can be seen in the result parameters such as <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial soil characteristics of the experimental field 2. Effect of CFF on growth parameters of brinjal 3. Effect of CFF on yield of brinjal 4. Electrolyte leakage study 5. Effect of CFF on post-harvest soil nutrient status under sodic soil. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Authors have added very good References but the reference styling is not uniform, better to follow APA style. It is better to add at least 2 more references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language and grammar is poor, need a revision for the grammar.	
Optional/General comments	The study is well organised and meticulously executed. Improvements are needed in English language, reference styling and some additional discussion.	

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>	NO

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Siddaraju M. N.
Department, University & Country	University College Mangalore, Mangalore University, India