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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | 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 provides strong evidence supporting the use of integrated nutrient management, particularly the combination of chemical fertilizers and biogas slurry, to improve maize growth, yield, and nutrient uptake. By presenting two years of field data, it highlights how balanced nutrient strategies not only boost productivity but also promote soil health and long-term sustainability. The findings can guide future research and help farmers adopt more efficient and eco-friendly practices. Overall, this study contributes practical insights that can improve nutrient use efficiency and crop performance in similar agro-ecological zones.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, if the current title clearly reflects the core focus of your study—such as the combined use of chemical fertilizers and biogas slurry for improving maize performance over two years—then it is suitable. However, if you'd like a more specific and impactful title, here is a suggested alternative:****"Enhancing Maize Productivity and Nitrogen Uptake Through Integrated Application of Biogas Slurry and Chemical Fertilizers: A Two-Year Field Study"****This title highlights the key treatments, target crop, focus on nitrogen uptake and yield, and the multi-year nature of the study, making it clear and informative for the scientific audience.** |  |
| 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 is fairly comprehensive if it includes the following:****Background or rationale of the study****Objective of the research*** **Key methods (e.g., treatments like CF, BS, etc.)**
* **Major findings with quantitative data**
* **Conclusion or implications for future use**

**Suggestions for improvement:*** **Add specific results – If not already done, mention key numeric outcomes (e.g., “T3 improved N uptake by 20%” or “Grain yield increased by 100% under T4”).**
* **Clarify treatments – Use full forms of CF (Chemical Fertilizer) and BS (Biogas Slurry) at least once to help readers unfamiliar with the abbreviations.**
* **Include time frame – Mention that this is a two-year field study to highlight reliability and repeatability.**
* **Avoid repetition – If the same result is repeated in multiple ways, simplify for clarity.**
* **Add one-line implication – End with a strong concluding sentence like:"This study supports the integration of organic and inorganic nutrient sources for sustainable maize cultivation."**
 |  |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and methodologically sound. The study is based on a well-designed two-year field experiment comparing different nutrient management treatments, including combinations of chemical fertilizers (CF) and biogas slurry (BS). The data analysis is appropriately linked to agronomic and physiological responses of maize, such as germination rate, plant height, biomass, cob characteristics, and nitrogen uptake.The findings are consistent with previous literature and supported by appropriate citations. Statistical significance has been mentioned (e.g., p-values), which strengthens the scientific validity. However, minor improvements in clarity, organization of the results, and language precision could further enhance the scientific presentation. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Yes, the references used in the manuscript are mostly sufficient and include several recent studies from 2017 to 2025, which strengthens the relevance and reliability of the findings. They cover a broad range of topics related to nutrient management, biogas slurry, maize physiology, and sustainable agriculture. However, a few more recent high-impact or region-specific studies on integrated nutrient management in maize could further enrich the manuscript. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article is generally understandable, but it needs moderate revision to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the scientific content is strong, some sentences are either too compressed, grammatically inconsistent, or lack clarity. Transitional phrases and linking words can be improved to enhance flow between sections. Also, a few typographical and punctuation errors should be corrected for better readability. |  |
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