## 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**

| **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.** | **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?<br>(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.** | |
| Minor REVISION comments<br><br>**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. | |
| **Optional/General** 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?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | |

**Reviewer Details:**

| | |
|---|---|
| Name: | **Gue Arsene** |
| Department, University & Country | **Universite Jean Lorougnon Guede, Cote d'Ivoire** |