Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_124862**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INFLUENCE OF LIQUID BIOFERTILIZERS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF SESAME (Sesamum indicum L.)**
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)*
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.	The research provides critical insights into the application of liquid biofertilizers on sesame growth and yield. In the current scenario, with increased concerns about soil degradation and the adverse effects of chemical fertilizers, this manuscript contributes to the scientific debate on sustainable agricultural practices. It emphasizes how biofertilizers can serve as a viable alternative to chemical inputs, improving plant health and yield without harmful residual effects. The results are valuable for both agronomists and farmers looking to enhance sesame productivity sustainably. Furthermore, the focus on sesame, an important oilseed crop, adds to the manuscript relevance, particularly in countries like India where oilseed self-sufficiency is crucial.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is appropriate and clearly describes the focus of the study. It includes the treatment (liquid biofertilizers) and the subject crop (sesame), making it informative and precise. No changes are necessary.	
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.	It provides a clear summary of the experiment, results, and conclusions. However, a brief mention of the statistical significance of the results, especially in comparison to control treatments, would strengthen the abstract. The abstract is somewhat vague in terms of the methodology and statistical results. While it highlights the findings, it doesn't provide enough detail on the statistical significance or the scope of the experiment. Include specific statistical information in the abstract, such as p-values or percentages of yield increase in relation to control treatments. Additionally, briefly mention the number of treatments and replicates for better context. The phrase "Results revealed..." could be expanded to provide specific insights into how biofertilizers enhance growth and yield mechanistically.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Introduction:** It lacks a strong connection between the identified problem (excessive use of chemical fertilizers) and the proposed solution (biofertilizers). Expand the introduction to better highlight the gap in knowledge this study aims to fill. A clearer rationale for using biofertilizers in sesame cultivation would strengthen the introduction. Discuss more about why sesame is a particularly relevant crop for biofertilizer trials, and how the study contributes to sustainable agriculture. **Materials and Methods**: The methods section provides a lot of technical details but lacks clarity in certain aspects, such as the exact application procedures for biofertilizers and fertilizers. There is also no mention of soil preparation or any controls for environmental factors. The description of the seed treatment and soil application of liquid biofertilizers is adequate but could be more precise. For instance, the incubation of the FYM and its integration into the soil should be clarified. Clarify and simplify the language in this section to make it more accessible to a broader audience. Include details about the soil preparation, environmental controls, and any pest or weed management practices that were used. Additionally, include a brief justification for the choice of experimental design (randomized block design). **Results and Discussion** 1. The Results and Discussion sections are combined, which can make it difficult to distinguish between the data presentation and the interpretation of the results. This structure often causes confusion because the reader has to switch between looking at the results and understanding the implications at the same time. Some results, such as those related to leaf area index and dry matter accumulation, are discussed only briefly and could be elaborated further, especially in comparison to the control and other treatment groups. 2. The manuscript lacks a detailed comparison of the results with previous studies. While some references are provided, the results are not sufficiently contextualized within the broader literature on biofertilizers and sesame yield improvement. Split the Results and Discussion sections into two distinct parts: Results: Focus solely on presenting the data, such as plant height, yield, leaf area index, and	

Review Form 3

	dry matter accumulation, with reference to tables and figures. Discussion: Provide a deeper analysis of the results and compare them to other studies. This will help in understanding how the findings fit into the larger body of research. Additionally, consider discussing potential limitations of the study, such as environmental factors that might have affected the results. 3. DAS is written in the text and result , does DAS means days after sowing or it is days where “y” is missing , check and correct. Also if DAS means days after sowing mention the fill form for the first time and then continue with abbreviated form. T**ables and Figures:** The tables provided are clear, but no figures (e.g., bar graphs, line graphs) are included to visually represent the data. This can make it harder for readers to quickly grasp the differences between treatments. Add graphs that depict key findings, such as plant height and yield across treatments. Visual representations can significantly enhance the clarity of the results and make the data more accessible to readers. **Conclusion:** The conclusion is relatively brief and does not discuss the practical implications or potential applications of the findings in agricultural practices. Expand the conclusion to emphasize the practical relevance of the study, especially in terms of its potential to reduce the use of chemical fertilizers in favor of biofertilizers. Include recommendations for future research, particularly on the long-term effects of biofertilizer use in sesame or other oilseed crops.	
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 is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experiment follows a well-established randomized block design, and appropriate statistical analyses were employed to interpret the results. The conclusions are supported by the data presented, with clear evidence of the benefits of combining chemical fertilizers with biofertilizers to improve plant height, dry matter accumulation, and yield in sesame.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The references appear sufficient, and most of them are relevant to the topic of biofertilizers and sesame growth. However, some additional recent studies on liquid biofertilizers or similar sustainable practices in oilseed crops could further enrich the literature review. If available, more recent studies on biofertilizers from 2023 and 2024 should be added to ensure up-to-date information.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language quality is generally good, but minor edits could improve readability. Some sentences are lengthy and can be shortened for clarity. For example, phrases like "This might be due to the synergistic relation between liquid biofertilizers and inorganic fertilizers" could be simplified for better comprehension	
Optional/General comments	Add more details about the potential mechanisms by which the biofertilizers enhance nutrient uptake (e.g., nitrogen fixation, phosphate solubilization) to strengthen the mechanistic understanding of the findings. The figures and tables provide clarity to the data, but visual enhancements like graph formats for the growth and yield comparisons might help in presenting the findings more effectively. Make an abbreviation table for all the abbreviations in the paper.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Aditi Bisht**
Department, University & Country	**India**