Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_126268**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Analysis of Inorganic and Organic Sources on Economic Viability Productivity of Turmeric (Curcuma Longa L.)**
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

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This research paper gives important insights into how different types of fertilizers, organic and inorganic, affect the growth and profitability of turmeric farming. Since turmeric is an economically and culturally valuable crop, especially in India, this study is relevant for promoting farming practices. The research offers useful information for improving turmeric yield and income while considering the environmental benefits of organic farming. This makes it valuable for researchers and farmers interested in agriculture.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and informative.	
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.	The abstract does a good job summarizing the research focus, importance, and main results. To make it even better, it could briefly state the main conclusion or practical advice based on the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The paper is well-organized, with sections that are easy to follow: introduction, materials and methods, results, and discussion. This structure makes it easy for readers to understand the research and findings.	
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.	The research appears scientifically sound, with a solid experimental setup, a variety of treatments, and thorough data analysis. The comparison between organic and inorganic fertilizers is well-supported, and the results align well with previous studies. The methods, findings, and conclusions show a good understanding of turmeric farming and the environmental effects of different fertilizers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Adding a few more recent studies (from after 2019) on the impact of biofertilizers or organic practices on turmeric yields could make the review even stronger and more up-to-date. If possible I want author to add this reference **Devi Priya B, Thyagarajan M .(2020) An investigation on production and productivity export performance of significant spices in the Country India. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology* .13(48): 4699-4707. https://doi.org/10.17485/IJST/v13i48.2191**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language and writing are suitable for academic readers, though small grammar improvements could make it clearer in some places.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	**B.Devi Priya**
Department, University & Country	**PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, India**