

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125858
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Comparative Study on the Efficiency of Tractor-Based Seed Drills in Ragi Farming</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

## 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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This manuscript shows the comparative study for sowing ragi by tractor operated seed cum fertilizer drill and broadcasting technique.</li> <li>2. The significance of manuscript is high in terms of productivity and mechanization perspective in ragi sowing.</li> <li>3. The theme of the study was scientifically good but the presentation was not appropriate.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The present title "Comparative Study on the Efficiency of Tractor-Based Seed Drills in Ragi Farming" doesn't provide complete description of manuscript. I request to modify the title as "Comparative field assessment of sowing of ragi by seed cum fertilizer drill and Broadcasting techniques".	
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.	<p>The first four introductory sentences are to be omitted from the abstract.</p> <p>In the abstract the authors wrote "The evaluation of tractor-operated seed drills has shown promising results, including a reduction in seed usage when compared to traditional methods". I request the authors to add the results of field evaluation and economic evaluation to justify the above-mentioned sentence in abstract.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>In the subsection material and methods I request to remove the manufacturer name Dharti agro in writing about seed cum fertilizer drill in place of Dharti agro the authors can add tractor operated .... row seed cum fertilizer drill</p> <p>In the subsection results The parameters headings "seeding rate" should be modified to "Seed Rate (SR)", Like wise heading "Field Emergence" should be modified to "Seed Emergence (SE)".</p>	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the introduction section, the authors didn't provide any significant reason in comparing the sowing of ragi seeds by the seed cum fertilizer drill and broadcasting techniques. Why authors selected seed cum fertilizer drill in comparison to broadcasting techniques even though many planters are exciting in the present era for sowing ragi seeds.</li> <li>2. Certain results of parameters were not mentioned in the manuscript like seed rate, economic parameters etc. I suggest the authors to add the seed rate of broadcasting technique in comparison to seed cum fertilizer drill.</li> <li>3. In terms field evaluation please incorporate the field capacity of broadcasting technique and justify w.r.t to field capacity of seed cum fertilizer drill. Thereby, the time saving by seed cum fertilizer drill in comparison to broadcasting can expressed.</li> <li>4. In same way I request authors to add the economic evaluation of both techniques comparatively. Justify in terms of labor requirement, cost of cultivation, benefit cost ratio of seed cum fertilizer drill in comparison to broadcasting technique. Thereby, how the seed cum fertilizer drill reduced the cost of cultivation, labor requirement in comparison to broadcasting can expressed.</li> <li>5. I request the authors to modify the summery and conclusion but adding the results of broadcasting technique. And modify the sentences by writing</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

	<b>comparatively.</b> <b>6. The total word count of the manuscript was 2456. Please ensure that the revised manuscript should contains words count greater than 3000 and less than 4000.</b>	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>Among 10 references only one reference was above year 2020, I request the authors add the recent references and eliminate the references before year 2010.</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	There were many Grammers errors in the induction sections. Please check and modify them.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors have done significant research work but that work was not presented significantly. I request the authors to please go through the manuscript thoroughly and write the results and discussion section technically.	

**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>Bharath Kumar Komatineni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maharana Prathap University of Agriculture and Technology, India</b>