

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_126073
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Wheat Growth and Yield: The Synergistic Effects of Nitrogen and Silicon Levels
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 article deals with a critical global issue - finding a solution to food problems, specifically by increasing wheat yield. The authors not only focused on nitrogen nutrition but also emphasized the importance of silicon for the growth and development of cereals. The work is of a high standard and deserves to be shared with the public.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	I would recommend adding a few sentences about the relevance and aim of the work.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, they are.	
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 submitted article contains all the necessary parts for it. The presentation of the material is logical and well-founded. The obtained data can serve as a good basis for solving the issue of increasing wheat yield for the researchers' region.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The list of references in its overwhelming majority highlights the latest trends in this field. However, it is not clear to me why in the text the references are cited by name and year, and in the list by the order of mention, and not alphabetized by the last names of the first author of each work. This is very inconvenient for working with references. In addition, it is not clear why the authors use works 15 and 16 from the Russian Federation in their work to justify the power supply. The authors of these studies are representatives of the aggressor country, which has been destroying the main wheat acreage in the country, which is one of the 10 exporting countries, for more than two years. Therefore, I would recommend replacing these links with the works of other authors. Those that are closer to the research region are better.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	It is not clear to me from the article in what form Si was used. It would be worth giving its characteristics. I would recommend paying attention to different font sizes. Also, in chemical formulas such as NaHCO ₃ etc., numerical values should be written with a subscript instead of reducing the font. Therefore, I recommend the manuscript for publication, with some minor revisions.	

Review Form 3

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:	Tetiana Tkachenko
Department, University & Country	V.P. Kukhar Institute of Bioorganic Chemistry and Petrochemistry of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Ukraine