

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJSSPN_122122</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of foliar nutrition on growth, yield and yield attributes of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) under medium black calcareous soil</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>	Agricultural sustainability is fundamental to accomplish the target of "Zero hunger" one of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Foliar application of mineral nutrients has become an inevitable agricultural practice for sustainable crop production worldwide. "Foliar nutrition" involves the application of any dissolved mineral nutrient directly to the plant foliage. Foliar fertilization draws attention as a quick, target-oriented, and environmentally compatible insurance to pursue higher crop productivity under optimal and unfavorable growth conditions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes title of the article is short and clear expressing what the research is about without use of unnecessary words.	
<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>	Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It is concise and the findings of the study are clearly written.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes the manuscript is well structured and the sections and subsections are well organized and appropriate.	
<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>	The manuscript is well-structured, synthesize the available evidence pertaining to the topic, convey a clear message and draw conclusion supported by data analysis. However, more updated references should be there for those readers interested in broadening their knowledge.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, references are suitable but less in number. Few more references should be added from current year or of 2023.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Quality of English in the article is suitable for scholarly communications. Scientific terms are used wherever required.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is well written. It should indicate the gap lapse of the study and also the importance of the manuscript that how it is different and unique from other research work.	

### 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>	

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ayesha Baig Sarim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Punjab University, Pakistan</b>