

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_128429
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of STCR Based Fertilizer Application on Soil Chemical Properties of Rabi Onion in Inceptisols
Type of the 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is useful for farmers, excessive use of fertilizer is harmful to soil, the auther suggested the use of vermicompost and biofertilizers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No not mention the onion in whole paper so avoid name	
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.	No ,many short form have used so rewrite the abstract and add exact method used for achieving results	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No because not explain the method ,no comparative study or not mentioned techniques visualization so difficult to understood	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All references are very old i.e like 1967 year	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Very less literature or writing work....many space is empty so not understood</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The topic is interesting, but it is not clear from the paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the abstract <p>To much short form has used so not understood the exact work of the paper .keyword is not matching with abstract.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. what data sets were used, with what attributes; 3. how authors have select the methods for results comparing, not explained which method or technology have used for obtain results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance the Introduction: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a more comprehensive overview of the current state of the art applications for vermicompost and biofertilizer importance globally. This will help position the study more precisely within the existing research landscape. 2. Elaborate on the specific challenges faced by Indian farmers in more detail and how the proposed system aims to address these challenges uniquely. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing and Visualization: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rewrite the manuscript to improve the clarity of writing. Use simpler language and more straightforward sentence structures, especially when explaining technical concepts. 2. Revise the tables and graphs. Add more detailed captions that explain the content and significance of each visual. Consider using more intuitive graphical representations, such as bar charts or heatmaps, to better convey the data. <p>how farmers will get help from developed results. It should be also mentioned that structure, formatting and language of paper should be improved. There are big monolithic fragments of sentences, difficult to read and understand logically, a lot of information which is out of scope, many typos in the text, links to references are made not accordingly with the rules.</p> <p>The paper need strong revision and rewriting.</p> <p>My recommendation is Not Accepted</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jyoti B. Deone</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>D.Y.Patil Deemed to be University, India</p>