



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AIR_38839 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Influence of integrated nutrient management on nutrient uptake by cotton and soybean in intercropping system |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 | <p>The authors have put considerable effort in constructing the manuscript. However there are several scopes for improving the manuscript.</p> <p>1) The manuscript needs to be more sound and compact. After which the manuscript can be accepted. Several words are missing.</p> <p>2) The authors are very reluctant give credits to early reporters, which is not ethical.</p> <p>3) Authors have repeatedly used “during both the years and in pooled data” in Result and Discussion section, which should be avoided.</p> <p>4) The study investigates the influence of integrated nutrient management on crop nutrient uptake. There are hundreds of reports available to the author. But I didn't find any mention of integrated nutrient management in the Introduction section.</p> <p>5) The study lacks suitable hypothesis and objective to carry out the investigation.</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Following are few specific comments.</p> <p>Line 11: “plot 101 ‘D’ 101 plot”</p> <p>This is no clear to me.</p> <p>Line 29-31: Recently, input-responsive varieties....</p> <p>Please provide reference.</p> <p>Line 36: Intercropping of cotton.....under rainfed condition</p> <p>Reference!</p> <p>Line 41:</p> <p>Authors have mentioned in introduction section about increasing costs and limited availability of chemical fertilizer. But they have completely forgotten to mention the negative impact of chemical fertilizer on soil and environment, which is more practiced discussed now a days.</p> <p>Line 42- 45: The ability to take.....environmental pollution.</p> <p>The statement remains unclear. Please reconstruct the same.</p> <p>Line 45-49:</p> <p>Provide reference with text.</p> <p>Line 52: plot 101 ‘D’ block</p> <p>Experimental site differs from as stated in Abstract.</p> <p>Line 66: 99.7.2015 ??</p> <p>Please be careful with dates and follow standard format of XX.XX/XXXX, e.g. 12.06.2016.</p> | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Line 69: RDF was applied.....according to population</p> <p>How was the amount calculated? Can you be more elaborative?</p> <p>Also, you are using the word RDF first time in the manuscript, so use the full form.</p> <p>Line 75:</p> <p>Which software was used for statistical analysis?</p> <p>Line 86: INM</p> <p>The word is used first time here. Use the short form in brackets along with full form.</p> <p>Line 94-95: The organic and green manures produce proper mineralization of nutrients.....</p> <p>Mineralization is a microbial process. How can organic and green manures produce mineralization of nutrients? However they can facilitate the microbial process. Rectify your statement.</p> <p>Line 106: Proper mineralization of nutrients by manures.....?</p> <p>Rectify your statement.</p> <p>Line 177- 179: Use of organic..... help in enriching soil.</p> <p>The statement is not clear.</p> <p>Line 182: Conclusion</p> <p>It seems authors were in hurry for concluding. They have recommended a particular dose for fertilizer (125: 62.5: 62.5 kg/ha N, P₂O₅ and K₂O) to the farmers, at the same time you have to mention on basis of what you are concluding in the Conclusion section. Also, they forgot to mention why not to adopt the other dose (100: 50: 50 kg/ha N, P₂O₅ and K₂O). Each section has to be self explanatory.</p> | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Arindam Sarkar |
| Department, University & Country | Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India |