

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_122264
Title of the Manuscript:	Standardization of earthworm densities for optimizing microbial activity during vermicomposting
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

[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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Standardizing earthworm stocking density in vermicomposting is essential for achieving consistent and reproducible research outcomes. It enables accurate comparison across studies by reducing variations in earthworm activity, which significantly impacts organic matter decomposition and nutrient cycling. Consistent stocking density also enhances microbial activity, leading to efficient composting and superior vermicompost quality. This uniformity is vital for advancing scientific knowledge and establishing research on vermicomposting with optimum stocking density of earthworms.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Yes, the author provides the good summary of his/her findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, they are.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a scientifically robust and technically sound study, with clear research objectives and appropriate methodology. However, the author should specify the statistical analyses used for data interpretation to enhance the transparency of the results. Additionally, referencing key statements and addressing grammatical errors or typos would improve the overall quality and readability of the manuscript.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>In the methods, your statement says "Organic wastes comprising of cow dung and straw at 1:1 ratio were used as the substrate" but in your data table shows "O.W. (500g CD + 500gStraw)."</p> <p>Also, double check with your statement in page 7, "This behaviour showed an increasing trend upto 30-40 earthworms showing a biomass range of 33 to 44 g earthworm kg-1 waste."</p> <p>In the methods, please write about the statistical approach you used to analyze your data.</p> <p>Since you used three replications in your study, in the table, please show your data in the form of mean ± sd.</p> <p>As you made all your statements through your findings based on the statistical test for the significance in your experiment. Please use ANOVA to test for the significance differences between group (treatment + control) means and then Tukey's HSD or any other test to provide a detailed comparison of all possible pairs of groups to identify which ones differ significantly, if you have not done so already.</p> <p>In page 5, please provide the reference for your statement "This was obviously due to gradual multiplication of these microorganisms in the organic matter rich substrates".</p> <p>In page 5, please provide the reference for your statement "The earthworm treatments resulted</p>	

Review Form 3

	in higher respiration values over the no earthworm treatment during initial period of the study, possibly due to increased pace of composting". Double check with other articles, as it is obvious, researchers might have mentioned that respiration slows down with the progress of vermicomposting.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The author needs to add few more references which I have suggested on my comments above.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall, it is a great original work.	

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:	Anon Chaulagain
Department, University & Country	University of Texas at Arlington, USA