

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_125924
Title of the Manuscript:	PROBING ACID SULPHATE SOILS FOR RICE PRODUCTION IN KUTTANAD
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.	I appreciate the manuscript for its comprehensive and detailed analysis of soil system. As this manuscript provides significant value to scientific community by addressing a key agricultural challenge-managing acidic, saline soils for rice cultivation. I like this manuscript as, this manuscript not only highlights the current soil issues, such as acidity and iron toxicity, but also offers practical solutions like liming and biochar application, which are grounded in both traditional and modern agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yeah, it's suitable but it could be more specific and engaging, if the title would be, "Probing Acid Sulphate Soils for Sustainable Rice Production in Kuttanad: Challenges and Solutions"	
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.	Yeah, the abstract of the manuscript is comprehensive and also I like to suggest to simplify the terms like "jarosites" and "phyto-mining technique", which might be difficult for readers unfamiliar with the subject.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are largely appropriate.	
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 manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound as it is based on the well-established research methods and references from wide range of credible studies. It addresses the complexity of the acid sulphate soils with detailed explanations of the physical, chemical and biological properties that impact rice production. Also, the manuscript proposes the practical soil management strategies, including liming, organic amendments and genetic tolerance.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The manuscript provides a substantial number of references, which appear to be relevant and cover wide range of studies on acid sulphate soils, soil management techniques and rice production in Kuttanad.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	There aren't competing interest issues in the manuscript which was also declared by the authors Based on the content of the manuscript, there are no apparent ethical issues.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prajwol Rijal
Department, University & Country	Institute of Agriculture and Animal Science, Tribhuvan University, Nepal