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|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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.** | **This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it offers practical, field-based insights into sustainable nutrient management using organic matter and vermicompost. In regions like Netrokona, Bangladesh—where soil fertility depletion is a growing concern—this study provides evidence of an effective alternative to synthetic fertilizers. By demonstrating measurable improvements in both soil health and tomato yield, it bridges the gap between organic soil amendments and real-world agronomic performance. The findings contribute to the broader discourse on ecological farming and offer scalable solutions for smallholder and low-input farming systems in subtropical regions.** |  |
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| 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. | **Yes, the abstract is quite comprehensive and effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. It touches upon the problem (overuse of chemical fertilizers), the experimental design, and the impact of treatments on soil fertility and tomato yield.****Suggestions for improvement:****1.A brief mention (e.g., field-based validation in Netrokona’s soil conditions or the specific combination rates used) would enhance the abstract’s impact.****2.Including one or two specific quantitative outcomes (e.g., % increase in yield or nutrient levels) would strengthen the abstract’s scientific value.** |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. It follows a sound experimental design (Randomized Complete Block Design), uses appropriate statistical tools (ANOVA and LSD), and presents results with proper significance testing. The data interpretation is logical and supported by relevant literature. The conclusions drawn are well-aligned with the findings and do not exaggerate beyond the data.Moreover, the manuscript clearly demonstrates the role of organic matter and vermicompost in improving both soil fertility and tomato productivity. The study adds field-based evidence in a region where such data is limited, making the research both valid and meaningful from a scientific perspective. |  |
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