

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122103
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTRIENT STATUS OF SOIL OF SUGARCANE AREA OF NAVSARI DISTRICT
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it provides valuable insights into the nutrient status of soils in the sugarcane-growing areas of Navsari District. Understanding soil nutrient dynamics is crucial for improving crop yields and sustainable agricultural practices, making this study highly relevant. I appreciate the manuscript's methodical approach, particularly the integration of satellite data with traditional soil testing, which enhances the precision and applicability of the findings. However, further discussion on the broader implications of these findings for regional and national agricultural strategies could enhance its impact.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>An alternative title could be: "Assessment of Soil Nutrient Dynamics in Sugarcane Cultivation Areas of Navsari District: Implications for Sustainable Agriculture"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement: Clarify the Objective: The abstract should explicitly state the primary research question or objective to provide a clearer context. Include Specific Results: Mention specific key findings related to nutrient levels, such as which nutrients were found to be deficient or abundant, to give readers a snapshot of the study's outcomes. Highlight Implications: Briefly touch on the practical implications of the findings for agricultural practices in the region, making the significance of the study more apparent.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>I carefully reviewed the manuscript from point to point .The structure and text of the manuscript are good, and the analysis and preparation of the manuscript have been done accurately. Generally, this manuscript will be helpful for readers of the Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition. But I have few concerns, I hope the authors will solve them in the revised version.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English text needs to be edited.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. The abstract demands substantial improvement to bolster its organization and clarity, as it currently lacks explicit objectives crucial for a comprehensive overview of the work. Additionally, there is a need for clearer articulation of the methodology employed in the study, as the existing description is somewhat ambiguous. Furthermore, the abstract could benefit from a more nuanced presentation of the research findings, as the current representation lacks depth and fails to convey the significance of the outcomes. To enhance the overall quality, it would be advantageous to incorporate key insights and potential implications of the study.</p> <p>2. The literature review requires a heightened level of critical examination. It is essential to delve deeper into the existing literature, emphasizing the need for a more discerning perspective to not only identify gaps and limitations but also to scrutinize the methodology and sources used in the reviewed studies. Additionally, the review lacks a cohesive synthesis of the literature, making it challenging for readers to grasp the overarching themes and contributions of various studies. Furthermore, there is an opportunity to enhance the engagement with contrasting viewpoints and divergent arguments within the literature, fostering a more comprehensive understanding of the subject matter.</p> <p>3. While the paper adeptly sets the stage by exploring aspects like plant growth parameters, there is a recommendation to introduce an additional section that delves into a comprehensive review of alternative technologies. This fresh segment should encompass a comparative analysis of these technologies, outlining their respective merits and demerits. It is crucial to underscore the advantages of the proposed process compared to conventional methods. This augmentation will not only bolster the scientific justification of the paper but also furnish readers with a holistic grasp of the broader spectrum of pertinent methods. Although the current methods are well-organized and thoroughly elucidated, the absence of this comparative insight might obscure the scientific rationale underpinning the proposed approach.</p> <p>4. Detailed Explanation of Methods: The section on Materials and Methods provides a good overview, but consider providing more detailed explanations for specific steps.</p> <p>5. A more robust development of the results and discussion section is warranted to ensure a comprehensive analysis of the findings.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Maryam Dadgar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Islamic Azad University, Iran</p>