

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_116061
Title of the Manuscript:	Study of physiological growth indices of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) to soil and foliar application through integrated nutrient management practices
Type of the Article	Research Paper

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) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes, the research is important to determine the optimum composition of combined inorganic and organic fertilizers Suggestion: Evaluating physiological growth indices of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) to soil and foliar application through integrated nutrient management practices Please write the abstract so that the readers will understand when reading it alone Crop growth rate and its relationship with yield needs to be one subsection More data on the fertilizer is needed. Yield data is needed Need more references	The research taken-up is in line with the reviewers' comments and was able to achieve with best results. It can be well considered for inclusion Necessary changes were done in abstract for better understanding of the content The data have been included and changes done as per the reviewer's comment The changes and inclusion of references were done as per the comment.
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English is good. However, the author needs to elaborate on the discussion about the mechanism and the reason why the crop growth rate of the application of Vermicompost is better than the FYM, combined with Nano-urea.	The reply has been detailed as per the reviewer's comment and have included the same in the content.
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	No