

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_120534
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of different Plant Densities and Fertilizer Levels on Yield Attributes, Yield and Fibre Quality characters of Bt Cotton in HDPS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study on the impact of different plant densities and fertilizer levels on yield attributes, yield, and fiber quality characters of Bt cotton in HDPS is crucial for the scientific community. This research may help in optimizing crop management practices, enhancing crop productivity, and improving fiber quality, which are essential for the sustainable development of the cotton industry. The findings can guide farmers in selecting the most suitable planting densities and fertilizer applications to maximize yields and ensure economic viability, thereby contributing to the overall efficiency and competitiveness of cotton production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add background information in abstract to highlight the research gap for this study. • Add brief methodology in abstract for better understanding of readers. • Add concluding sentences in abstract also. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction is short and lacks sufficient information to highlight the need of this study. • Material methods are not appropriately described in the study. Please add complete details for clear and reproducibility. • Data is not appropriately analysed statistically. • Results are well described and discussion is very poor. 	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript is not well written and need to revised. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References are not sufficient; please add more references to improve the manuscript. 	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English quality is very low 	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manuscript is not well written, revise as per following suggestions, • Introduction is short and lacks sufficient information to highlight the need of this study. • Material methods are not appropriately described in the study. Please add complete details for clear and reproducibility. • Data is not appropriately analysed statistically. • Results are well described and discussion is very poor. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No , there are no ethical issues in the manuscript.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aneela Nijabat
Department, University & Country	University of Mianwali, Pakistan