

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_121287</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EFFECT OF DIFFERENT PLANT SPACINGS ON GROWTH, YIELD AND DISEASE INCIDENCE IN BANANA CV. PHULE PRIDE</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it provides valuable insights into optimizing plant spacing for banana cultivation, specifically for the Phule Pride variety. The research shows how different planting distances affect the growth, yield, and disease incidence in bananas, which can help improve farming practices. I appreciate this manuscript because it can offer practical recommendations that can enhance banana production and potentially increase farmers' incomes. It is straightforward and provides data on how to achieve better results with this banana variety.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes, the title is suitable for the article. It conveys the main focus of the research</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is sufficient but some sentences need clarity, proper punctuation, and sentence structure. (<i>see annotated manuscript</i>) It is also advised to include statistical values in the abstract when stating significant results. Including statistical values, such as p-values, confidence intervals, or effect sizes, provides readers with a clearer understanding of the significance and reliability of the findings. It also allows readers to assess the robustness of the results and their practical relevance</p> <p><i>Suggested Abstract:</i>  A field experiment was conducted in 2017 at the Instructional-Cum-Research Farm, Department of Horticulture, College of Agriculture, Badnapur, VNMKV, Parbhani, to evaluate the impact of plant spacing on growth, yield, and disease incidence in banana cv. Phule Pride. The study utilized a randomized block design with five replications, testing four spacing treatments: 1.5 x 1.5 m, 1.8 x 1.8 m, 2.1 x 2.1 m, and 2.4 x 2.4 m. Data on various growth parameters (plant height, pseudostem girth, number of leaves, leaf area, and total dry matter) and yield parameters (number of hands per bunch, number of fingers per bunch, finger weight, and bunch weight) were collected and analyzed. The results indicated that the closest spacing (1.5 x 1.5 m) significantly improved growth parameters, including plant height (<i>insert statistical value</i>), pseudostem girth (<i>insert statistical value</i>), number of leaves (<i>insert statistical value</i>), leaf area (<i>insert statistical value</i>), and total dry matter (<i>insert statistical value</i>). Yield parameters were also highest at this spacing, with the number of hands per bunch, number of fingers per bunch, finger weight, and bunch weight showing significant increases (<i>insert statistical value</i>). However, the closer spacings of 1.5 x 1.5 m and 1.8 x 1.8 m were associated with a higher incidence (<i>insert statistical value</i>) of Sigatoka leaf spot. Based on the findings, a spacing of 1.8 x 1.8 m is recommended for achieving an optimal balance between yield and disease management in banana cv. Phule Pride.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes, I believe some are appropriate but some sections need major improvement such as the following:</b></p> <p><i>Introduction</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Context: Provide a clearer background on the importance of the study and its relevance.</li> <li>Literature: Cite relevant studies succinctly to support the research rationale.</li> <li>Objective: Clearly state the aim of the study and its expected contribution.</li> </ol> <p><i>Taking productivity into consideration, the present experiment was conducted to evaluate the feasibility of closer plant spacing for the cultivar Phule Pride to</i></p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p><i>augment yield.</i> Suggested revision: ...the present experiment was conducted to investigate varying spacing distances between each plan and its effect on different growth and yield parameters, including disease susceptibility.</p> <p><i>Materials and Method</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Detail: Specify experimental conditions, including site and setup.</li> <li>2. Design: Ensure clarity in describing the experimental design and treatments. Include subsections such as site and sample preparations. How are the spacing distances established? How were the plant materials sourced? How are the plants planted? How were they maintained and monitored? How were conditions standardized?</li> <li>3. Measurements: Clearly outline parameters measured and how data were recorded. There should be subsections for how each parameter was taken. For example, measurement of growth parameters, measurement of yield parameters, and measurement of disease incidence. Also, a description of the statistical method used, a very important part, is lacking.</li> <li>4. Define: Some parameters that were gathered need to be defined properly in the methodology such as “maturity”, “functional leaves”. You need to provide information on how you establish these parameters</li> </ol> <p><i>Results and Discussion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Results: Present findings concisely with supporting data. Some data can be presented well in figure form such as a bar graph. Better present the growth parameters in increments. Growth increments provide clear, quantitative data that show how much growth occurred over a specific period. This allows for precise measurement of changes and trends, rather than just static comparisons. Indicate significant results by providing symbols such as asterisk, etc.</li> <li>2. Interpretation: Results were compared with other studies but need better discussions on the implications of results and possible explanations for observed trends.</li> </ol> <p><i>Conclusion</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Summary: Summarize key findings and their practical implications.</li> <li>2. Recommendations: Provide clear recommendations based on the study’s results and suggest areas for further research if relevant.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>There are significant shortcomings in methodological details. The manuscript lacks major details on how the experiment was conducted—such as the experimental design, sample size, and procedural specifics. This raises my concerns about the validity and reproducibility of the results. Additionally, inadequate information on data collection and analysis methods can undermine the reliability of the conclusions drawn. Without these crucial details, it is challenging to assess the accuracy and generalizability of the findings, which diminishes the scientific rigor of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Yes, I believe the references are sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I recommend language editing for the article.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p><b>Although the study is relevant, major sections in the methodology are lacking, data presentation needs to be improved, data interpretation needs to be elaborated and validity needs to be established.</b></p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Diana P. Paguntalan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of The Philippines, Philippines</b>