Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_126620
Title of the Manuscript:	**SOIL TEMPERATURE RESPONSES TO VARIED IRRIGATION SCHEDULES, TILLAGE METHODS, AND NPK FERTILIZER APPLICATION RATES.**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript significantly contributes to understanding how tillage practices, irrigation levels, and NPK fertilizer rates influence soil temperature as a key factor for crop growth. This study equips local farmers with data-driven insights to optimize crop management. Implementing these findings can help farmers achieve better crop yields while conserving water, reducing input costs, and minimizing environmental impacts. Local agricultural extension programs can further leverage these findings to train farmers in best practices, enhancing food security, economic stability, and environmental resilience in the region using this information as reference.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	The title is concise and commendable, but it can be revised into " Optimization of Soil Temperature Dynamics under Different Irrigation Schedules, Tillage Methods, and NPK Fertilizer Application Rates"	
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 comprehensive, but it can be improved. You may add a sentence that clearly describes the research gap that the study specifically addresses.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The materials and methods are appropriate. However, some sub sections could be more improved to provide in depth information and understanding to the readers and future researchers who intends to do similar work. For example, for the results and discussion, you may further improve by interpreting the results through discussions like why is the results like that?what could be the possible effect or meaning?what might be the cause or effect? The statement of previous works is commendable, however you can add more related and similar works to support your discussion.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is very informative making it technically robust and can be easily understood by a reader and a future researcher who wishes to conduct similar work. The method of optimization strengthens the reliability of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	The references are sufficient, however, it might be beneficial to include more studies from similar agro-ecological zones or related research on drought-prone wheat cultivation to provide a broader context. You may also try to look into this and add into your reference that I ran into, for additional citation on soil temperature and irrigation. Cooling Effect of Different Irrigation Methods in the Growth Stages of Chili Pepper (Capsicum frutescens L.) | Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The language of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, although some minor areas were observed that need improvement and clarity. In Section 3.1, please check the paragraph that starts with " The adequate precision ratio …, please check " confirming the signal-to-noise ratio" if this is really needed in the study.	
Optional/Generalcomments	Overall the manuscript is suitable for publishing. I suggest to add more references in discussion section to elaborate more on the results of the study.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's comment***(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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Glaizalyn B. Lictawa**
Department, University & Country	**Nueva Vizcaya State University, Philippines**