Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102184
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient requirement of pre-release sugarcane varieties in Vertisols of Northern Telangana Zone
Type of the Article	Research Article

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	 In the Telangana region, sugarcane is grown in an area of 0.35 lakh hectares with a production of 3950 lakh tonnes and productivity of 79.80 tonnes ha⁻¹ (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2018). Sugarcane being a long duration comprehensive crop with substantial nutritional demand, produces a heavy tonnage and tends to remove considerable quantum of plant nutrients from the soil thus rendering soil less fertile and fails to produce higher crop. Fertilizers play a chief role in increasing sugar production, because of their influence on cane tonnage. 	
	 Yes, the title of the manuscript is appropriate enough. 	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	 Yes, the abstract written is comprehensive. 	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	o Yes, they are appropriate enough illustrating the general sub-sections viz.,	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Abstract, Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion as well.	
	 The data have been concisely documented in tabular forms. The figures shown are exemplary. 	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	 Appropriate fertilization is a vital supervision function in sugarcane production. Thus, it is essential to hoard sugarcane crop with the immense three (N, P and K) to secure good cane quantity and quality. Moreover, it has been earlier reported that chemical source of fertilizer (N, P and K) at the rate of 225-112-168 kg ha⁻¹ evidenced to be more effective to produce pointedly greater plant height and thicker cane girth, more tillers, better brix, higher sugar recovery and maximum cane yield ha⁻¹. The present investigation has concluded that the adoption of promising sugarcane variety 2010 R 854 with 125 % RDF (312.5-125-125 kg N-P₂O₅-K₂O ha⁻¹) is recommended for Vertisols of the Northern Telangana Zone. 	
	The references cited are adequate and recent enough.	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)		
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	 Abstract, 3rd line: with the factorial concept- add an article. Keywords-must be a single word. Introduction, 3rd line: In the Telangana region, sugarcane is grown- add an article and a missing verb. Introduction, 8th line: sugarcane crops- fix the agreement mistake. Introduction, 8th & 9th lines: depends upon the choice of variety and the adoption of balanced nutrition. The usage of the English language is appropriate and well suitable for scholarly communications. 	
Optional/General comments	 Data analysis was computed by following the statistical methods out lined by Panse & Sukhatme (1978). The benefit Cost Ratio (B:C ratio) was worked out based on the standard procedure (Gittinger, 1982). The cultivation practices were carried out periodically and the cane yield was recorded at harvest. Overall, the manuscript has been succinctly written and well-presented with related statistical data that has been documented in the form of fine Tabular forms. The figures are well-presented too. 	

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)
	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Asma Jabeen
Department, University & Country	Indian Institute of Rice Research, Osmania University, India

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)