

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_123779
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Irrigation and Nitrogen Applied at Critical Stages on the Yield and Yield Attributes of Boro Rice in North-Western Part of Bangladesh
Type of the Article	Research Article

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>

Review Form 3

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 examines the effects of nitrogen and irrigation on Boro rice, a staple food in Bangladesh. While the study aims to determine rice yield under specific nitrogen and irrigation levels, it primarily covers foundational aspects that lack significant novelty. Additionally, the abstract and the treatment application sections are poorly articulated and require substantial improvement. The manuscript also fails to demonstrate how it adds value to the existing body of knowledge on the subject.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No it's not. The suitable title of this manuscript could be "Nitrogen and irrigation enhance the chlorophyll content and yield of Boro rice".	
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.	<p>No it's not.</p> <p>Here are some suggestions to improve the manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should start with a general statement about the study, followed by the specific objectives. Currently, the author has used "yield" and "yield attributes" consecutively, which affects the readability. Consider replacing "yield attributes" with an alternative term to enhance clarity. 2. The methodology section is confusing and mirrors the wording found in the methodology itself. It needs revision to improve coherence and avoid repetitive statements. 3. In the results section, it is recommended to use active voice for a clearer presentation of findings. <p>Overall, these changes will help enhance the manuscript's readability and scientific value.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, However, methodology lacks sections for results that are presented.	
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 correct because it aligns with widely accepted knowledge that specific levels of irrigation and nitrogen improve rice yield. The observed increase in chlorophyll levels supports the link between higher chlorophyll content and enhanced rice yield. The findings are consistent with established research, demonstrating that the study's approach and results are sound and reliable. Overall, the study accurately reflects the effects of nitrogen and irrigation on rice yield.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Zarish Maqsood
Department, University & Country	Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan