

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_124508
Title of the Manuscript:	Fertilizer Micro-dosing: Evaluating the Yield Response of Sorghum to Different Levels of Fertilizers Applied on the Planting Pit at Mereb-Lekhe District
Type of the Article	Original 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.	Evaluating the response of sorghum to different levels of fertilizer is something that should always be encouraged. The multiplicity of this topic, in different regions with different climates and soil nutrients, is vital for increased production, which is ultimately one of the purposes of science.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the article title is appropriate	
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 article summary is satisfactory	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	It is necessary to use statistics to make the results of this paper scientifically robust and thus prove the effectiveness of comparing the effect of different fertilizer levels.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, but could be more current	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	The publication must be accepted	

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:	Willames de Albuquerque Soares
Department, University & Country	University of Pernambuco, Brazil