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| 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.** | **This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides critical insights into optimizing the cultivation of *Corchorus olitorius* (jute mallow), a plant with valuable fiber and nutritional properties. By evaluating the effects of intra-row spacing and various organic manure types, the study offers practical guidelines to enhance growth, yield, and fiber quality, including achieving the highly desirable golden-colored fiber. The findings highlight the environmental and economic benefits of using organic manures, contributing to sustainable agricultural practices. Furthermore, the study underscores the potential of jute as a biodegradable, eco-friendly material, aligning with global efforts to promote sustainable and environmentally conscious fiber production.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, It Suits 100 %** |  |
| 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 provides a comprehensive overview of the study, detailing the objectives, experimental design, key results, and conclusion. However, there are areas where clarity, conciseness, or additional details could improve its readability and effectiveness. Here are my suggestions:****Points to Add:**1. **Objective Clarification: Briefly mention why the study is important or its broader implications, especially in terms of jute mallow's agricultural or economic significance.**
2. **Highlight Statistical Methods: Include a bit more detail on the ANOVA and Tukey-HSD analysis, such as the variables compared or trends observed.**
3. **Environmental and Economic Relevance: Expand slightly on why jute mallow's biodegradability and market value make it a "fiber of the future."**

**Points to Modify/Refine:**1. **Condense Experimental Details: The description of the experimental setup is too detailed for an abstract. Simplify the explanation of intra-row spacing and manure types while retaining essential details.**
2. **Focus Results: The results section is extensive. Focus on the most critical findings, such as which treatment consistently produced the best outcomes.**
3. **Language Precision: Phrases like "did not differ significantly" can be replaced with clearer alternatives, e.g., "showed no significant difference."**
 |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the details provided. The study design, statistical analysis, and interpretation of results align with established agricultural research practices. However, some areas require clarification or revision for scientific rigor and clarity:****Strengths:**1. **Study Design:**
	* **The use of a 2 x 4 factorial experiment and Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replications is appropriate for evaluating treatment effects.**
2. **Variables Analyzed:**
	* **Comprehensive analysis of growth, yield, and fiber quality parameters provides meaningful insights into the impact of spacing and organic manure.**
3. **Statistical Analysis:**
	* **Using ANOVA and Tukey-HSD for comparing treatment means is scientifically valid.**

**Areas for Improvement:**1. **Terminology:**
	* **The term "spacing's" should be corrected to "spacings" throughout the manuscript for grammatical accuracy.**
2. **Quantitative Results:**
	* **While some data is presented (e.g., survival rate, plant height), numerical values for all significant findings (e.g., specific leaf weights, fiber yield) should be included for transparency.**
3. **Control Treatment Results:**
	* **While it is noted that control plots had the lowest performance, numerical values or percentage differences should be provided for better comparison.**
4. **Fibre Quality Indices:**
	* **The manuscript mentions fiber color indices and the "golden color fiber." It would benefit from explaining how these indices were measured or rated.**
5. **Environmental Implications:**
	* **The concluding statement on environmental friendliness and future potential of jute fiber is valid but requires supporting references or data to strengthen the claim.**
6. **Formatting and Grammar:**
	* **Phrasing like "means of treatments were significant at (p≤ 0.05)" should be revised for clarity, e.g., "where treatment means were significant at p ≤ 0.05."**
	* **The pluralization in "data was collected" should be corrected to "data were collected."**
	* **Standardize units of manure application (e.g., "5 t ha⁻¹" instead of "5t ha-1").**

**Recommendation:****The manuscript is scientifically sound but needs grammatical refinement, clearer presentation of results, and additional methodological details for publication readiness.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **Pease write counting numbers 1, 2 , 3 ……… in references.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, satisfied. |  |
| Optional/General comments | As mentioned above. |  |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  | ***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*** |  |
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