

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_118186
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Soil Quality Dynamics for Improving Rice Yield in Farmer's Field
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, Recommendations include optimizing nitrogen management practices and promoting the use of organic manures to improve soil health and fertility. By implementing targeted interventions informed by these findings, farmers can achieve higher and more sustainable rice yields, contributing to food security and agricultural sustainability in the region.</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>Additional suggestions/comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - The manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. 2 - Abstract : Informative, gives an overview of everything in the research. 3 - Introduction : there is bring out the importance of the subject (Understanding Soil Quality Dynamics for Improving Rice Yield in Farmer's Field) and presented an overview of current research on the subject. 4 - Materials & methods : the suitability and technical standards of the methods is very good. 5 - Sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses have been carried out. 6 - Results & discussion : the data well controlled and robust. 7 - The relevant and current references during discussion. 8 - Discussion and conclusions based on actual facts . 9 - Conclusion : supported by the data and discussed inside the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Should be replicated the experiment for another season</p> <p>in page (5+ 6) : in all the References</p> <p>Add and before the last author</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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> No	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahrous Abd El-Baset Attia
Department, University & Country	Field Crops Research Institute, Agricultural Research Centre, Egypt