

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_124983
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of different levels of Phosphorus on growth and yield of wheat cv. Shatabdi
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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 a crucial element of agricultural science, concentrating on the influence of phosphorus concentrations on wheat yield. This research is important as it offers insights into adjusting phosphorus levels to improve wheat yield, especially pertinent for agricultural operations in phosphorus-deficient soil locations. The results can assist in developing improved fertilizer management strategies and enhance sustainable agriculture practices. The outcomes may enhance wheat productivity and food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is explicit and appropriate for the manuscript's substance. It delineates the study's scope and emphasizes the principal variables and outcomes. No modifications are recommended.	
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 thorough, encapsulating the study's aim, methodology, principal findings, and conclusion. Nevertheless, it would be advantageous to incorporate the precise significance levels (e.g., p-values) for the comparisons conducted, to elucidate the statistical robustness of the findings.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is systematically structured, featuring relevant subsections that encompass the introduction, materials and techniques, results, discussion, and conclusion. The information is organized coherently, and the tables and figures substantiate the findings proficiently.	
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 rigorous and technically proficient. The experimental design is suitable, and the statistical analyses are accurately implemented. The research methodologies are delineated with adequate specificity, enabling other researchers to duplicate the work. The conclusions are substantiated by the supplied facts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and relevant to the study. Most of the citations are recent, and they provide a good foundation for the research context. There are no additional references required at this time.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language/English Quality: The language used in the manuscript is generally appropriate for scholarly communication, but there are some grammatical errors and awkward sentence structures that need correction. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Four levels of Phosphorous including control viz. (i) T0 = 0 kg P ha-1 (Control) (ii) T1 = 25 kg P ha-1 (iii) T2 = 50 kg P ha-1 and (iv) T3 = 80 kg P ha-1 were used as experimental treatments."• Suggested correction: "The experiment consisted of four phosphorus levels, including a control: (i) T0 = 0 kg P ha-1 (Control), (ii) T1 = 25 kg P ha-1, (iii) T2 = 50 kg P ha-1, and (iv) T3 = 80 kg P ha-1."	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Aloke Verma
Department, University & Country	Kalinga University, India