

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_117076
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of nitrogen and zinc on yield and economics of Pearl millet
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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<p>1.- Yes, because of the practical implications 2.- Yes 3.- No. Need to improve. Methodology Details: While it mentions the use of a Randomized Block Design, the abstract could benefit from briefly describing the location and environmental conditions, as these are crucial for interpreting the applicability of the results. Significance and Implications: The abstract could articulate why these findings are significant. For instance, mentioning how these results could influence farming practices or policy would provide context on the impact of the research. Conclusions: A brief statement on the broader implications of the findings or recommendations for future research could enrich the abstract. 4.- The structure appears to follow a conventional scientific research format, but there are areas where it could potentially be improved for clarity and depth Separate Results and Discussion: Combining results and discussion can sometimes limit the depth of each. Separating these sections could allow for a more detailed presentation of data followed by a deeper analysis concerning the implications and comparison with other studies. More Detailed Discussion: The discussion could be expanded to better explore how these results compare with existing literature, possibly explaining any discrepancies or confirming previous findings with new evidence. Enhanced Conclusion: The conclusion section could better summarize the key findings, their implications for agricultural practice, and suggestions for future research directions. It could also reflect on the limitations of the study to give a more balanced view. Addition of Subsections: Introduction: Could benefit from a clearer statement of research objectives or hypotheses. Results: Subsections by type of data (e.g., yield data, economic data) could make the findings more digestible. Discussion: Subsections reflecting different themes or questions raised by the results would help in navigating the analysis. 5.- No. It needs a broader results presentation, also a deeper discussion. Need graphs. Enhancing the presentation of results and deepening the discussion could significantly improve the manuscript's clarity and impact. Here's how these elements could be strengthened: Broader Results Presentation: Graphical Data Representation: Including graphs to visually represent the yield and economic data would make the results more accessible and easier to understand at a glance. Graphs like bar charts for yield comparisons and line graphs showing nutrient effects over time could be particularly effective. Detailed Data Breakdown: Expanding the results to include more detailed breakdowns, such as the effects of treatments on different growth stages of the crop or environmental impact assessments, could provide a more comprehensive view of the outcomes. Additional Statistical Measures: Reporting additional statistics, like confidence intervals or effect sizes, could provide deeper insights into the reliability and practical significance of the findings. Deeper Discussion: Contextualization Within Broader Literature: The discussion could more thoroughly compare the study's results with those of other studies in different regions or under different conditions, highlighting similarities and differences. Addressing Limitations and Variability: A more explicit discussion of the limitations of the study, such as potential biases, measurement errors, or the impact of uncontrolled variables, would strengthen the scientific credibility. Implications for Future Research and Practice: Expanding on how these results could influence future research directions, policy making, or farming practices would make the discussion more relevant and valuable to readers. Theoretical Implications: Discussing the theoretical implications of the findings in terms of agricultural science or ecological balance could provide a deeper understanding of the</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>systems involved. Implementation: Graphs: Include graphs in the results section to illustrate key data points and trends. Tables: Enhance tables to show additional details like statistical significance, and include annotations for easier interpretation. Discussion Section: Structure the discussion to first summarize findings, then compare with existing literature, discuss the practical and theoretical implications, and finally, address limitations and future research directions. 6.- The manuscript could significantly enhance its credibility, relevance, and applicability by improving the references section adding: Global Comparative Studies on Pearl Millet, Recent Advances in Agronomic Management, and Economic Impact Assessments in Agriculture.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are several opportunity areas in the paper, that must be improved:</p> <p>Results Presentation: Include graphical representations to enhance the clarity and impact of the yield and economic data presented.</p> <p>Discussion Depth: Expand the discussion to better contextualize the findings within the broader literature, address limitations more explicitly, and discuss the implications for future research and practical application.</p> <p>Language and Style: Improve the clarity and readability of the manuscript by simplifying complex sentences, varying sentence structure, and ensuring consistent terminology and style throughout.</p> <p>Reference Update: Augment the current references with more recent and relevant studies, including global perspectives and detailed economic analyses related to agricultural practices.</p> <p>Structural Adjustments: Consider separating the results and discussion sections to allow for a more detailed presentation and in-depth analysis of findings.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Edgar Arturo Chávez-Urbiola
Department, University & Country	National Polytechnic Institute (IPN) Mexico, Mexico