

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_127077
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Natural Extracts During Storage Conditions on Seed Quality and Yield Performance of Soybean Cultivar Giza 22
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights, offering a novel perspective by using the natural extracts and its effect on seed quality and field performance. Its rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis contribute to advancing our understanding of seed treatment with natural extracts. The work's potential to influence future research directions and inform practical applications makes it highly significant. However, some areas could benefit from further clarification or additional data to strengthen the conclusions drawn. Overall, the manuscript is a promising contribution to the scientific community, with the potential to spark further research and discussion.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Effect of Natural Extracts on the Seed Quality and Yield Performance of Soybean Cultivar Giza 22 During Storage Conditions.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>1. The results section is somewhat dense, and while it is important to present the data, some numbers (such as percentage values and specific measurements) might be more effectively placed in the body of the article rather than in the abstract. For instance, the specific values for germination rate (88.77%) or seed yield (1.68 tons/feddan) could be summarized more generally. Suggestion: Instead of listing all specific results, you could consolidate findings. For example, "Cool storage combined with DE treatment showed the most significant improvements in germination, seedling vigor, and seed yield." 2. While DE, NSE, and SG are introduced, NSE and SG are not discussed as thoroughly in the results section, making it seem that DE had the most significant effect. If the study emphasizes DE more, this could be highlighted in the abstract. Suggestion: Clarify if DE was the most effective treatment overall, or if NSE and SG had notable effects as well, even if not as significant as DE. 3. The storage conditions (ambient vs. cool storage) and storage periods are mentioned, but the abstract doesn't provide enough detail on how these factors were analyzed (e.g., were there statistical tests used for comparison?). Suggestion: Add a brief mention of the statistical methods used for comparison (e.g., "Data were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) at P = 0.05"). 4. Replace "(Cont.)" with "control treatments" or "untreated control seeds."</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>YES, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are relevant and appropriate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-structured experimental design and the use of appropriate methodologies. The study employs a Completely Randomized Design (FCRD & RCBD), ensuring statistical reliability and minimizing bias in the results. Furthermore, the investigation carefully considers key factors such as storage conditions, seed treatments, and their combined effects on seed quality and yield performance, which are essential for understanding the practical implications of seed preservation. The manuscript also draws on established scientific principles and previous research, incorporating natural extracts like Diatomaceous Earth, Neem Seed Extract, and Silica Gel—each supported by prior studies for their effectiveness in enhancing seed viability and protecting against pests and pathogens. The use of multiple experimental conditions, including varying storage environments and seed treatments, strengthens the conclusions and ensures the results are relevant for real-world agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>⋮</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and up-to-date, covering key aspects of seed quality, longevity, and the use of natural extracts for seed preservation.</p> <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent Innovations in Seed Storage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Nanotechnology in Seed Preservation: Impacts and Prospects" (2023). <i>Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology</i>. ○ "Effects of Modified Atmosphere Packaging on Soybean Seed Quality during Storage" 	

Review Form 3

	<p>(2022). <i>Food Packaging and Shelf Life</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Factors in Seed Storage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Impact of Temperature and Humidity on the Longevity and Quality of Soybean Seeds" (2023). <i>Seed Science Research</i>. • Sustainability and Organic Approaches: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Organic Seed Storage and Management: Current Approaches and Future Prospects" (2023). <i>Journal of Organic Agriculture</i>. <p>By integrating these additional references, the manuscript would benefit from an even broader scientific context, showcasing the latest trends and advancements in seed storage and treatment.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas where clarity and flow could be improved for greater precision and readability. The manuscript employs formal academic language and adheres to standard conventions in scientific writing, such as the clear definition of objectives, methods, and results. Additionally, while the scientific terminology is appropriate, there is occasional redundancy that could be eliminated for a smoother reading experience. Overall, the article conveys its message effectively, but minor revisions for language precision would help elevate its suitability for high-impact scholarly publications.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A. Akhil Reddy
Department, University & Country	Professor Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, India