Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJSSPN_124342**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Productivity and profitability of kharif rice (Oryza sativa L.) under seedling age and nitrogen management**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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.	This manuscript examines the influence of seedling age and nitrogen fertilizer on the growth and yield of rice. The findings may assist farmers in selecting optimal seedling ages to enhance their yields. I propose that, with the incorporation of the necessary revisions and recommendations, this manuscript could be beneficial to both the scientific community and agricultural producers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title has the potential for enhancement.	
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.	Given that this is an international journal, it would be advisable to select a currency that is widely recognized by readers. It is essential to specify the quantity of each fertilizer, even when the percentage is provided. Additionally, the type of statistical analysis employed has not been indicated. Furthermore, the explanation of the experimental design methodology lacks clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The content of this manuscript is well-organized and adheres to the required formats for articles.	
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 study presents a comparative analysis of various treatments, specifically seedling age and different nitrogen treatments, employing methodologies widely recognized within the scientific community. However, the incorporation of statistical models such as ANOVA would have further strengthened the scientific validity of the findings, as the results would have been substantiated through a significance test.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	Certain references utilized in this study are considerably outdated. The rationale for employing varying seedling ages is substantiated by a single reference.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	English can be enhanced.	
Optional/General comments	**Methodology** To enhance the document, several observations should be considered. First, it is essential to provide a clear and detailed explanation of the methodology employed in the study. Additionally, incorporating control treatments is crucial for enabling meaningful comparisons with other treatments. Or you can explore the literature to identify commonly employed practices, such as seedling age and the types of fertilization applied. The specific harvest date has not been indicated in your study. Additionally, the sowing dates range significantly from July 18 to October 1, raising concerns about the potential impact of such a wide variation on the measured crop parameters. It is essential to consider how these differences in sowing dates might influence the overall results and interpretations of the study. Your investigation into the effects of seedling age was conducted in the main plot, while the subplots were designed to assess varying nitrogen content. However, when examining the two distinct experiments—seedling age and nitrogen treatment—several critical details remain unaddressed. Firstly, the type of nitrogen treatment applied to the main plots has not been specified, which is crucial for understanding the experimental design. Secondly, similar omissions are present in the subplots, where the specific seedling ages utilized have not been disclosed. The choice of different nitrogen sources lacks justification, which is necessary for a comprehensive understanding of their relevance to the study. Providing clarity on these aspects will enhance the credibility and interpretability of your findings. **Results and discussion** In present for you are only writing discussion in light of previous studies. You should discuss the result of your study then compare with previous findings and give reason for similarity and differences. The results and discussion section should be well-structured; it is important to first present the results, followed by a discussion of these findings, and then to compare them with those obtained by other researchers in the same field. For instance, you can reformulate this part: “The study analyzed plants that S_2: 4 weeks old seedling (28 days) produced the tallest plant (102.0cm) and highest number of tillers per hill (13.91) whereas the shortest plant (94.5cm) and lowest number of tillers per hill (12.05) was produced by S_3: 5 weeks aged seedling (35 days) (Table 2). Older seedlings usually recover more slowly (Rajendran *et al*., 2004) [17].“ by “**The findings indicate that the treatment involving S2, which consisted of 4-week-old seedlings (28 days), resulted in the tallest plants, measuring 102.0 cm, and the highest average number of tillers per hill, recorded at 13.91. In contrast, the S3 treatment, utilizing 5-week-old seedlings (35 days), yielded the shortest plants at 94.5 cm and the lowest average number of tillers per hill, which was 12.05, as detailed in Table 2. This observation aligns with the conclusions drawn by Rajendran et al. (2004), who noted that older seedlings tend to exhibit slower recovery rates**.” 1The findings presented in 3.2 Yield and yield attribute may relate to the yield, as previously discussed in the earlier section regarding the results associated with the tiller. This section reiterates the same findings. The findings indicate that the s2 variant demonstrates superior grain yields. It is essential to analyze and interpret these results in light of this observation. I have observed that no figures have been utilized in the presentation of data; I recommend representing some of this information in graphical form rather than in tables. There are numerous abbreviations present without their meanings being provided. It is also essential to include the definitions of these abbreviations at the bottom of the tables. The absence of information regarding the calculation of the cost of cultivation is notable. It is essential to highlight these details within the methodology.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment** *(if agreed with the 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 detail)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Traore Adama**
Department, University & Country	**Université Joseph Ki Zerbo, Burkina Faso**