

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJSSPN_129917
Title of the Manuscript:	From Seed to Sod: Investigating the Role of Growing Media in Turf Grass Germination for Premium Sod Quality
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<i>I had the opportunity to read and review the manuscript entitled "From Seed to Sod: Investigating the Role of Growing Media in Turf Grass Germination for Premium Sod Quality". The manuscript represents an essential contribution to knowledge and is worth publishing. The research presented in this manuscript can be applied by other scientists working in areas related to landscape gardening.</i>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<i>The title is attractive and matches the content.</i>	
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.	<i>The abstract is clear but incomplete. Authors should briefly describe what was done and why they conducted this research. Keywords correspond to the aims and objectives of the manuscript.</i>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<i>The following issues need further improvement:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>My main criticism of the authors is that the research presented only includes results from one experimental year, making it underpowered.</i> 2. <i>Consider using more specific diagrams or visual aids to assist readers in better understanding the results rather than relying solely on tables.</i> 3. <i>Consider including meteorological data from the experimental farm area related to the time when the experiments were conducted.</i> 4. <i>The conclusion is lacking in sufficiency and can be improved.</i> 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<i>The references are acceptable</i>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<i>There are some mistakes in grammar and language. The language can be improved.</i>	
Optional/General comments	<i>In my opinion, this manuscript is acceptable for publication after being substantially modified according to the remarks.</i>	

Review Form 3

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:	Mariyana Georgieva
Department, University & Country	Institute of Plant Physiology and Genetics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria