

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJSSPN_126361 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Impact of Nutrient Management Practices in Cassava on the Growth and Yield of Red Gram in an Additive Series Intercropping System in the Southern Laterites of Kerala |
| Type of the Article | Original Research 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: 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. | Yes | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes | |
| 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. | Yes | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes | |
| 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 scientific robustness of this manuscript is evident from its structured experimental design, which includes randomized block design (RBD) with replications to assess the impact of nutrient management on cassava-legume intercropping. The study utilizes a potassium-efficient cassava variety, Sree Pavithra, and incorporates biofertilizers (PGPR Mix 1) to examine their effects on nutrient uptake, which strengthens the validity of the nutrient management approach. By quantifying yields, growth, and Land Equivalent Ratio (LER), the manuscript offers clear metrics for evaluating intercropping benefits. The detailed focus on nutrient levels of N, P, and K, especially potassium's role, aligns well with the crop's nutrient needs and ensures that the findings can contribute to practical improvements in cassava-legume intercropping systems. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | yes | |
| Minor REVISION comments | Yes | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | Check my comment in 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: | Felix Satognon |
| Department, University & Country | Auburn University, United States |