

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124559
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking Potential: The Rise of Rice Fallow Pulses in Agricultural Innovation
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

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>
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.	The importance of the article is in the utilization of the rice fallow land to be utilised for the pulses. This article highlights the proper use of the fallow land for other cropping activities. Utilisation of fallow land for pulses enhances the land's capability. Overall, the article has the potential to be informative to readers for the agri. researchers dealing with the land use.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title captures the main theme of the whole article. But, it could be more suitable focusing on rice fallow pulses in the particular region. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlocking Agricultural Potential through Rice Fallow Pulses in Tamil Nadu • Rice Fallow Pulses for Agricultural Potential for South Asian Region 	
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.	The abstract only mentions about the "rice fallows" and "scenario of India". <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should brief more on the overall assessment of the situation of the rice-fallow-pulses as the article shows; such as the problems it is facing in its application, innovative methods developed in its application, adaptability in the region and others 2. The abstract should clearly mention – for which area – it is trying to discuss. Is it for South Asia, or for India or for states of India (south region or north). This will provide the authors the chance to be more precise on providing the relevant examples / literatures. 3. The first / second sentence of the abstract should be more on defining the rice fallows and the rice fallow pulses more comprehensively to capture the whole essence of the article. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The whole sections of the article should be more focused on the single region or particular area. Section such as "Rice fallow pulses for various regions" is vague. 2. The other is to divide the sections into further sub sections. Most of the sub sections can be further arranged under the sub-sub sections – such as using the heading as "Current practices", inside this, plant population, nutrient application can be placed. – Similarly, the introduction, can have the sub sections of the scopes, regions. 3. More works might be needed for the sub sections structuring the article. 	
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.	If the article is considering the topic as innovation, more focus should be on the advantages of the topic. The main advantage is the nitrogen fixing from the pulses, more literature should be cited to justify the eventual positive aspects of the article balancing the weakness / challenges of the topic. The article has approached in its lower productivity and other challenges, which is technically justified. If applicable, under the "Table2 - Technologies to overcome constraints", any research conducted should be highlighted.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References seem evident to the given article.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Further revisions might be required in improving the grammar for article readability. The text can be understood for the general reader.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Keshab T. Magar
Department, University & Country	Nepal