

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121600
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the influence of integrated nutrient management on yield and economics of wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.) in North India Plains
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 <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.	The research topic is good and successful. The quality of the content is good. What I like is that the economic analysis is included in the study and evaluated in all aspects.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	According to the context, the title has a very broad meaning. The study applies to a specific region. The title should be revised.	
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 summary of the article is comprehensive. It covers all aspects of the study in general. The items to be added are indicated in the file.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	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 results obtained from the article are consistent with previous studies. The results confirm each other. It contributes to scientific studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are up to date, but insufficient according to the study. There are many studies on the subject. Especially the discussion section could be strengthened with more references.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The spelling of the article is appropriate and the English quality is good.	
Optional/General comments	The article is suitable in general terms. However, there are necessary corrections and additions. The article should be revised both in accordance with the journal's article writing rules and in accordance with the general requirements. Attention should be paid to references, units, tables and punctuation.	

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:	Merve Bayhan
Department, University & Country	Dicle University, Turkiye