Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Research Journal of Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJA_128315**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Assessment of Cationic Micronutrient status for Efficient Farm Management in an Experimental Farm in the Tiruvannamalai District, Tamil Nadu, India**
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript builds on assessing the status of soil nutrients for proper management in terms of correcting deficiencies and avoiding over fertilisation. Soil nutrients are fundamental in agricultural production as they aid crop to growth and quality of yield. This promotes better human and animal health as they both feeds on the crops produced on soils. The manuscripts highlight the importance of rectifying deficiencies.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title is suitable. But I would love to suggest this one to avoid repeating the word "farm" in the title. Proposed title: Assessment of Cationic Micronutrient status for Efficient Experimental Farm Management in the Tiruvannamalai District, Tamil Nadu, India**	
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.	**In the abstract,** **- the authors did not define the full names of Zn, Cu, Fe and Mn as they first appeared. I am suggesting that they define them as they first appear and then they can abbreviate them to rest of the manuscript. This is to help a lay person understand.** **- Surprisingly, the authors reported the range and mean of Zn and decided to leave the other micronutrients. Are they not important, what was guiding this selection. It is better if the sampling strategy, area sampled, and number of samples come into abstract for easy transition from the methodology.** **- The authors are mentioning a certain percentage of samples being under a particular category for iron, manganese and zinc. This is confusing to the reader. Questions such as how many samples that category are and which ones out of 118 will rise. My suggestion they must specify this category in terms of the area because they even have maps. The maps are clearly showing the distribution of the micronutrient quantities in the farm. They must use them to their advantage.**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**The manuscript it is not scientifically correct. To quote the objective, "the study was undertaken in an experimental farm falling under Alfisol soil order to delineate and to prepare GPS-GIS based delineation map of available Zn, Cu, Fe and Mn". From the objective, it clearly shows that the manuscript is build on digital soil mapping hence derivation of spatial distribution maps. To the reviewer's surprise, the authors do not have sound methodology on how the distribution maps were derived. What tool did they use for their derivation. Before maps could be generated there are semivariograms to be generated as inputs to digital maps, why are they not reported and their models. When spatial maps were generated, which interpolation technique was used and why specifically selecting that one?**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**The references are sufficient for the manuscript.**	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**The English quality is fair. The authors should check grammatical errors spotted in the manuscript and avoid repeating points.**	
Optional/General comments	**On top of the comments raised above, in the introduction it clearly shows that the manuscript is built on the deficiency of Zn and Fe. What was the motivation in also assessing the status of Cu and Mn? In the farm, what crops are being grown, are the deficiency affecting the crops in the farm? In the methodology, the authors have mentioned that they have analysed the physicochemical properties yet there is no physical property analysed. May rectify this. If there are no physical properties analysed, the authors do not they want to see what could be driving the deficiency of the micronutrients, maybe analyse the macro and some physical properties? This could enhance the strength of the manuscript.**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Seome Michael Swafo**
Department, University & Country	**University of Limpopo, South Africa**