

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

Review Form 1.7

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | V. N. Meena Devi |
| Department, University & Country | Noorul Islam Centre for Higher Education, India |