

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_124936
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Irrigation schedules and Nitrogen Levels on the growth and Productivity of Cabbage plant in Yobe's Semi-Arid Region.
Type of the Article	Research

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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.	This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it highlights practical ways to boost cabbage yield in semi-arid regions using optimized irrigation and nitrogen levels. I like how it provides clear, actionable insights that can help farmers conserve water while improving productivity. However, it could be even better with more focus on how these findings might apply to other crops or climates.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Impact of Irrigation Schedules and Nitrogen Levels on the Growth and Productivity of Cabbage in Yobe's Semi-Arid Region," is clear and descriptive, but it could be more concise and engaging. With "Optimizing Irrigation and Nitrogen Levels for Enhanced Cabbage Growth in Yobe's Semi-Arid Region."	
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.	The abstract is clear, but it could be more concise and reader-friendly. It would help to focus on the main goal of optimizing irrigation and nitrogen levels to boost cabbage yields in semi-arid regions. You can also mention how the best combination (6-day irrigation and 100 kg/ha nitrogen) led to the highest yields, while briefly noting that less effective treatments resulted in lower productivity. Cutting down on specific measurements and focusing more on the practical benefits for farmers would make it more engaging.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and follow a clear scientific format. The Introduction sets the stage well, the Materials and Methods provide solid detail, and the Results and Discussion effectively connect findings to previous research. However, tightening up some sections, like simplifying the methods and making the discussion more concise, would enhance readability. The Conclusion is good but could be more impactful by emphasizing the practical benefits and suggesting clear next steps for future research.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically solid because it uses a clear experimental design and considers important factors like irrigation and nitrogen levels. The data is well-analyzed, with results that make sense based on the conditions tested. It also ties in well with previous research, showing that the findings are consistent with existing knowledge, which strengthens its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are solid and recent, but a few are a bit dated (like from 1982 and 1990). Adding more recent studies, especially on climate resilience and global perspectives on semi-arid agriculture, would strengthen it. Otherwise, it's well-researched.	

Review Form 3

<p>=</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: The title can be clearer and more engaging—try something like, "How Irrigation Schedules and Nitrogen Levels Affect Cabbage Growth in Yobe's Semi-Arid Climate." 2. Abstract: The abstract feels wordy. Simplify it by focusing on key findings and making the sentences shorter and more direct. 3. Grammar: Add commas and other punctuation where needed, especially in lists like "3 6 and 9 days" to avoid confusion. 4. Units: Make sure you're consistent with units of measurement (e.g., "kg ha⁻¹" instead of "kg/ha"). 5. References: The referencing format is inconsistent. Stick to a specific style, whether it's APA, MLA, or a journal requirement. 6. Introduction: The introduction is heavy on global data but light on local context. Why is cabbage important in Yobe? Add that for a stronger local connection. 7. Objectives: Be clearer about your research objectives or hypothesis right at the start. 8. Literature Review: You could add more recent studies, especially about semi-arid climates and the effects of irrigation and nitrogen on cabbage. 9. Methods: Some parts of the methods section are a bit hard to follow. For example, clarify what "composite samples based on treatment" means. 10. Tables: The tables could be formatted more clearly, with defined borders and proper headings to make them easier to read. 11. Abbreviations: Explain any abbreviations in the tables, like THH and LHD, so readers know what they mean right away. 12. Statistics: You mention using LSD but don't explain your statistical methods. Briefly describe the tests and software you used for clarity. 13. Results: Provide a bit more explanation when discussing why certain treatments worked better. For instance, why did the 6-day interval outperform the 9-day one? 14. Discussion: Explore potential study limitations. Were there any other factors besides irrigation and nitrogen that might have affected the results? 15. Recommendations: Your recommendations section feels repetitive. Make it more practical for farmers with specific tips based on your data. 16. Sustainability: Talk about how these practices can be sustainable long-term, especially in terms of water use and nitrogen's environmental impact. 17. Visuals: Adding graphs to represent your data visually would help readers understand the trends more easily. 18. Conclusion: Strengthen the conclusion by clearly summarizing the key findings and tying them back to your original goals. 19. Updated References: Some of your references are a bit outdated. Where possible, update them with recent research to keep the paper current. 20. Language: Some sections feel a bit too formal. Try simplifying the language in parts to make the paper more reader-friendly. 	

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kapil Prasad Marasini
Department, University & Country	HICAST (Himalayan College of Agricultural Sciences & Technology), Nepal