

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126560
Title of the Manuscript:	Maximizing productivity and profitability of rice through crop establishment methods and weed management practices in winter rice-garden pea relay cropping system
Type of the Article	Original research paper

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Rice is crucial for food security in India and worldwide. So looking for an efficient, water, labor, and energy-efficient alternative to conventional puddled transplanted rice and practices that can mitigate weed infestation that poses a threat to yield is necessary. It is in this context that the present research work is inscribed and I find it interesting.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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 of the article comprehensive. I suggest the deletion of the sentence “The soil of the experimental site was sandy clay loam in texture, medium acidic in reaction, medium in organic carbon and available N and low in available P2O5 and K2O.” and other words in order to 300 words or less than 300 words.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure of the manuscript are acceptable. But you can use number for subsections and structures.	
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.	Methods (experimental design, data analysis, etc.) use in this research paper is correct. And the research has been done in two years (repetition). So I find think this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Yes, I think the references are sufficient and recent.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but there are a lot of inattention errors in the text. Some full stops miss or are in there place. I don't see some tables or the figures in the text. For some table different fonts are used. The references should be seen again. See the authors'guide.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research paper is interesting but I think its author wrote it being a hurry. They must re-examine the manuscript and I think, it will an excellent research paper.	

Review Form 3

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	