

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117286
Title of the Manuscript:	Examining the Effects of Diverse Irrigation Regimens and Planting Timelines on Wheat Growth, Yield, and Yield Characteristics
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal’s peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of ‘**lack of Novelty**’, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair Fair	Okay Noted Thanks
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair	Okay
Optional/General comments	The introduction lacks clear aims and objectives, which are essential for guiding readers through the article's purpose and scope. The methodology section could benefit from greater clarity to ensure readers understand the approach taken in the study. Exploring higher IW/CPE (Initial Weight/Constant Potential Energy) values could potentially enhance the investigation's depth and insights. Statistical details were noticeably absent in the materials and methods section, which is crucial for ensuring the study's rigor and reproducibility. Comparing the obtained data with existing literature and engaging in more thorough discussion would enrich the analysis and interpretation of the results.	Improved Okay Improved

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)	