

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126545
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluating Tillage Management and Chickpea Varieties for Enhanced Nutrient Uptake in Mungbean-Chickpea Sequence
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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>	This manuscript is important because it explores how tillage methods affect nutrient uptake in chickpea varieties, which can help improve sustainable farming practices. The clear methodology and practical findings offer useful guidance for farmers looking to optimize their crop management. I appreciate the focus on real-world applications, but the discussion could be expanded to better explain the non-significant results and their relevance to existing research.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title "Evaluating Tillage Management and Chickpea Varieties for Enhanced Nutrient Uptake in Mungbean-Chickpea Sequence" is good because it clearly describes the study. A simpler option could be: "Effect of Tillage and Chickpea Varieties on Nutrient Uptake in Mungbean-Chickpea Rotation." This keeps the main ideas but makes it a bit shorter.	
<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>	The abstract is generally comprehensive but could be improved by clarifying the significance of the non-significant results for nutrient content in chickpeas, which would provide better context. Additionally, including a sentence about the practical implications of the findings for farmers or agronomists would enhance its relevance. Finally, making the wording more concise by reducing repetitive phrases would improve readability. These adjustments would strengthen the overall clarity and impact of the abstract.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, as they follow a clear and logical format that includes aims, methodology, results, and conclusions.	
<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>	This manuscript is scientifically strong because it has a clear experimental design with a strip plot layout and good replication, which helps ensure reliable results. It focuses on tillage management and chickpea varieties, which are important for understanding nutrient uptake in sustainable farming. The methods are well-defined, making it easy to reproduce the study, and the analysis of nutrient levels offers useful insights, making it relevant to the agricultural community.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Not written properly	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language in the article is generally good for scholarly communication. It is clear and mostly free of grammatical errors, making the findings easy to understand. However, some sentences could be simplified for better readability. With a few minor changes, the language would be suitable for a scholarly audience.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript offers valuable insights into tillage management and chickpea varieties, enhancing our understanding of nutrient uptake. The methodology is solid, and the results are useful for farmers. However, the discussion could explore the implications of the non-significant results more deeply, and improving clarity in some sections would enhance readability. Making these changes would strengthen the manuscript's impact.  There don't appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript. There don't seem to be any competing interest issues in this manuscript, but authors should always disclose any financial or personal interests that could affect the research	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Rakesh Kumar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SKUAST, India</b>