

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127698
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of tillage and weed management practices on growth, yield attributes, soil chemical properties and economics of wheat
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

#### **PART 1: Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> ( <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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript provides valuable insights into optimizing tillage and weed management practices for wheat cultivation under the Middle Gangetic Plains. By analyzing productivity, profitability, and soil dynamics, it addresses critical challenges in sustainable agriculture. The findings offer practical solutions for improving wheat yields, reducing weed infestations, and enhancing resource use efficiency, contributing to food security and environmental sustainability.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	

**Review Form 3**

<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Redundancy in Statistical Results:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeating statistical phrases like "statistically at par" without clarity adds redundancy.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Ambiguity in Comparisons:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phrasing like "significantly superior" lacks specific comparative details or statistical data (e.g., P-values or LSD).</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Formatting Issues:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent unit placement (e.g., spacing in "g m-2").</li> <li>• Incorrect spacing around symbols like "₹ ha-1".</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Overly Complex Sentences:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several sentences are lengthy and can be broken down for clarity.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Misuse of Terms:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Characters of crops" should be replaced with "crop traits" for scientific accuracy.</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Typographical Errors:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "B:C ratio" should consistently appear as "Benefit-Cost ratio" if used in a formal context.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improve and write conclusions in detail.</li> <li>2. Add Future Aspects</li> <li>3. Introduction:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Grammatical Errors:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "Wheat (Triticum aestivum) is one of the most important staple food of India." → Should be "staple foods of India."</li> </ol> </li> <li>b) <b>Inconsistent Data Presentation:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "14.25% (107.86 MT)" lacks clarity in separating the percentage from the quantity; better phrasing needed.</li> <li>b. "5.83% (6.22 MT)" similarly requires clearer formatting for readability.</li> </ol> </li> <li>c) <b>Awkward Sentence Structure:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "In India terms of wheat production..." is awkwardly phrased and lacks clarity; should be "In terms of wheat production in India..."</li> </ol> </li> <li>d) <b>Repetition of Concepts:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The importance of zero-tillage systems is mentioned multiple times without adding new insights, leading to redundancy.</li> </ol> </li> <li>e) <b>Unreferenced Claims:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Statements like "The herbicide market in India is growing rapidly..." and "Foliar applications are preferred..." lack specific citations.</li> </ol> </li> <li>f) <b>Misuse of Terms:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. "Improper tillage practices" could be rephrased as "suboptimal tillage practices" for better scientific accuracy.</li> </ol> </li> <li>g) <b>Overly Long Sentences:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Some sentences are excessively lengthy and could be split for better readability (e.g., the sentence discussing "ready-mix formulations").</li> </ol> </li> <li>h) <b>Lack of Statistical Context:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Discussion of yield losses from weeds (e.g., "15% to over 50%") would benefit from specifying the study context or conditions.</li> </ol> </li> <li>i) <b>Inconsistent Capitalization:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Terms like "zero-till systems" and "Zero tillage" are inconsistently capitalized.</li> </ol> </li> <li>j) <b>Missing Focus in Objective Statement:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The study's objective statement is too broad and could be more focused on specific outcomes like weed suppression, yield improvement, and economic feasibility.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Material and Method:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>Grammar and Clarity:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"No any farm operation and residue was left..." → Should be "No farm operation or residue was left..."</li> <li>"The location of experiment is under middle gangetic plains region of agro-climatic zone III A..." → Should be "The experiment was conducted in the Middle Gangetic Plains region of agro-climatic zone III A..."</li> </ul> </li> <li>b) <b>Redundancy:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Weedy plots, however, continued to be infested with native weeds throughout the growing season." This is</li> </ul> </li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>self-evident and can be omitted for conciseness.</p> <p>c) <b>Inconsistent Terminology:</b> Use of "PoE" is not expanded until later in the manuscript, potentially causing confusion. Ensure abbreviations like PoE (Post-Emergence) are explained upon first use.</p> <p>d) <b>Inconsistent Units and Formatting:</b> Some units like "m2" should be written as "m<sup>2</sup>." Fertilizer application rates are inconsistently formatted (e.g., "150 kg N" vs. "60 kg P2O5").</p> <p>e) <b>Awkward Sentence Structure:</b> "The soil of the experimental plot was silty clay loam in texture, low in fertility status of organic carbon..." can be rephrased for better readability.</p> <p>f) <b>Lack of Specificity in Methodology:</b> "A uniform recommended dose of 150 kg N, 60 kg P2O5 and 40 kg K2O ha-1 was applied..." lacks clarity on the source of these recommendations. Cite references or guidelines for the recommended doses.</p> <p>g) <b>Inconsistent Use of Scientific Terms:</b> The term "spike initiation stage" is used without prior explanation or context for non-specialist readers.</p> <p>h) <b>Repetition of Information:</b> Details about weed management practices (e.g., two manual weedings) are repeated unnecessarily in the section.</p> <p>i) <b>Inappropriate Phrasing for Scientific Context:</b> "Ensure that the plots remained free of weeds" is subjective and informal for scientific writing; rephrase to "Manual weeding was conducted to maintain weed-free conditions."</p> <p>j) <b>Omission of Important Details:</b> The methodology does not specify whether environmental factors (e.g., rainfall, temperature) were monitored, which are critical for field experiments.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	n/a	

**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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Abdul Basit</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pakistan</b>