

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125276
Title of the Manuscript:	MULTI-MICRONUTRIENT (S, B & Zn) DOSES ON YIELD AND RESIDUAL EFFECT ON RICE-GROUNDNUT CROPPING SYSTEM IN ALFISOLS OF ODISHA
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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 manuscript is important not only for the reality of the cultivation in the installed region but also in the economic part, soil management and crop association and its maximum use for the benefit of the farmers and the community.	This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community, particularly in the field of agronomy and soil science. It addresses the crucial role of micronutrients like sulfur (S), boron (B), and zinc (Zn) in improving crop productivity in the rice-groundnut cropping system on Alfisols, a soil type with limited fertility.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	If it is suitable.	Yes it is suitable, as it clearly indicates the main focus of the study.
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.	Needs improvement, it will be carried out as required in the review of the paper.	Ok
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	If they are appropriate.	Ok
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.	It is correct according to the indications to improve.	It has been modified as per the comments.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Most references are not current, so it is recommended to look for references from recent years when reviewing.	New recent references added
Minor REVISION comments	You need to improve your language, sometimes the writing is a bit confusing.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	