

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Soil Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ASRJ_127507
Title of the Manuscript:	Combination nutrient management for sustainable economically effect on onion (Allium cepa L.) seed production at Maitsebri, Northern, Ethiopia
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.	This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community as it explores sustainable nutrient management for onion seed production using NP fertilizers and vermicompost. It highlights improved seed yield, quality, and economic returns while reducing reliance on chemical inputs. The findings support sustainable agriculture and address key challenges in onion seed production, benefiting farmers and enhancing food security.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it needed to be changed as the Title is a little bit hard to understand but matching the written content.	
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 effectively summarizes the article and engages readers. Minor modifications and abstract changes are suggested in the track change.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript's structure is well-organized, with each subsection logically following the previous one. Ensure each subsection addresses specific points to maintain clarity and coherence.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not relevant add some more references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, but some parts need minor edits to improve clarity and flow. Making sentences clearer and using simpler terms in a few places will help readability and accuracy.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are so many grammatical errors in the article, such as prepositions, articles, redundancy, and some minor mistakes.	

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:	Varanasi Adarsh
Department, University & Country	Gandhi Institute of Engineering and Technology, India