

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_107849
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Rice-Wheat Cropping System: Assessing the Performance of Happy Seeder in Paddy Fields
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, it is because the manuscript is prepared based on the testing of two seeders, taking into account their efficiency and operational cost per hectare, while crop residue burning is prevented. 2. Yes, it is. 3. The abstract was written to provide an overall concept of the manuscript, but it lacks some main information such as the objectives of the study and the experimental design layout. Besides that, some of the results presented in the abstract were not actually studied at all, and those include soil bulk density and farmers' feedback over the use of the seeders. Therefore, it is suggested that the author double-check that and revise the abstract accordingly. 4. Yes, the manuscript was properly structured because it consisted of the main components required for a typical paper format. However, improvements are needed to ensure the manuscript is publishable. Below are the comments for improvement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Introduction section: The introduction was well written by describing general information about the agricultural practices and narrowing it down into specific issues that can be dealt with by means of utilizing any suitable seeding equipment. Despite that, the format for citation seems not to comply with the journal guidelines because of bolding. Besides that, some scales such as "lakh" and "crores" are not easily recognizable to general readers, so it is more suitable if English scales are used instead and then the author just uses conversion values for the two scales. - In the method section: much of the information was provided in the method section to ensure the testing was properly done. However, a lot more modifications are required, as shown below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pictures and specifications of the two tested seeders were not given, so it is hard to visualize them. Therefore, it is important to add this information. • The experimental plot layout was not displayed, and the experimental design was not also given. Based on the reading, this study tested two seeders at three different speeds, each replicated three times, so the total number of plots should be 18, but the manuscript mentioned only 6. Therefore, it is advised that the author should double-check that and provide all the information needed. • Soil bulk density was mentioned, but it was not studied. Therefore, please consider removing that. • The formula for effective field capacity was not correct. Please double-check that and write the right formula. • The statistical tests and software used for the analysis were not given, so it is hard to conceptualize how the collected data were analyzed. - In the results section: the results present the findings based on the methodology described, but there are some errors that need modifying as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The graphs displayed were not well designed yet because all the words were capitalized, which is not suitable for scientific writing. Besides that, graph No. 2 had a compressed y-axis number, and that did not look good. So, it is advised to improve that graph. • The result of the economic analysis was described, but any related table or figure was not given. So, it is suggested the author should provide that to easily compare the description with the data analyzed. • The whole discussion is missing. - In the conclusion section: It was well written by summarizing the main part of the result, but the statement related to the farmers' feedback should be removed because it was not studied in this manuscript. - Some more references should be given to each part of the manuscript to provide stronger support to the study. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	- The quality of the English writing is very good.	
Optional/General comments	- This manuscript should be revised properly and substantially because a lot more information is needed to make it good enough for publication. Therefore, it is suggested that the author should take action accordingly and this needs quite a lot of time. In my point of view, this manuscript needs a substantial revision; thus, a quick publication is not recommended.	

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:	Lyhour Hin
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Agriculture, Cambodia