

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_126286
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield enhancement of Bt cotton through canopy management under rainfed condition
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript "Yield Enhancement of Bt Cotton Through Canopy Management Under Rainfed Condition" is valuable for the scientific community as it tackles critical challenges in cotton production under variable rainfall conditions. The study effectively demonstrates how innovative agronomic practices such as high-density planting and specific canopy management techniques can significantly improve yields and economic returns. While the experimental design and results are commendable, the manuscript could benefit from a deeper discussion on the long-term implications and scalability of these practices in diverse agricultural contexts. Overall, the findings contribute valuable insights that can inform future research and practical applications in cotton farming.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Yield Enhancement of Bt Cotton Through Canopy Management Under Rainfed Condition" is generally suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the study on improving cotton yield through specific agricultural practices in a rainfed context. However, it could be made more concise and engaging. A possible alternative title could be "Optimizing Bt Cotton Yields with Canopy Management in Rainfed Environments." This revision emphasizes the optimization aspect while retaining the core elements of the research.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>The abstract offers a solid overview of the study, detailing its objectives, methodology and key findings. However, it could be enhanced by explicitly stating the primary objectives at the beginning to provide context for the study's significance. Additionally, including a brief statement about the broader implications of the findings for sustainable agriculture and cotton production in similar regions would enrich the narrative. Mentioning relevant statistical analyses used to support the results would add rigor and credibility, while acknowledging any limitations of the study or experimental conditions would provide a more balanced view. Incorporating these elements would improve clarity and depth, making the abstract more informative and engaging for readers.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate for effectively conveying the research. The organization into clear sections such as Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion and Conclusion facilitates a logical flow of information, guiding the reader through the study's rationale, methodology, findings and implications. To enhance clarity, however, consider adding subheadings within the Results and Discussion section to differentiate between various findings or themes. Including a brief summary of key findings at the end of the Results section could further reinforce the main points before transitioning into the Discussion. Overall, while the structure is sound, these minor adjustments could improve clarity and readability.</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness and robustness through its methodical approach and rigorous experimental design. The use of a randomized block design with multiple treatments and replications ensures the reliability of the data and the validity of the results. Additionally, the incorporation of well-established agronomic practices, such as high-density planting and canopy management techniques reflects a sound understanding of the principles underlying cotton cultivation. The statistical analysis of results along with a thorough discussion of growth parameters and economic returns, further underscores the technical soundness of the research providing valuable insights for improving cotton yield in rainfed conditions. Overall, the manuscript contributes meaningful findings to the field of agricultural science, particularly in the context of sustainable practices for cotton production.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript provide a strong foundation, however I recommend incorporating more recent studies from the past five years to improve its relevance. Including current research on optimizing Bt cotton yields through canopy management in rainfed environments will offer valuable and updated insights.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication with a clear structure and coherent flow of information. However, there are some areas where improvements could enhance clarity and precision. For instance, technical terms should be consistently defined and some sentences could be simplified to improve readability. Additionally, minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing should be addressed to ensure a polished presentation. Overall, while the manuscript is comprehensible, a thorough proofreading and revision for language and style would strengthen its scholarly quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Streamline the abstract to focus on significant findings and their implications clearly stating the purpose, methods, key results and conclusions in a structured manner. 2. In the introduction, provide more background on the challenges faced in cotton cultivation particularly in rainfed conditions and clearly articulate the research objectives and hypotheses. 3. In the materials and methods section, include more specifics about the experimental setup such as soil preparation and environmental conditions and justify the number of replications while explaining any statistical methods used for analysis. 4. Break down the results into clearer subsections (e.g., growth parameters, yield data, economic analysis) for better organization, ensuring all tables and figures are clearly labeled and referenced in the text to highlight their significance. 5. In the discussion, interpret the findings in relation to existing literature, discussing both expected and unexpected results while acknowledging any limitations of the study and suggesting areas for future research. 6. Provide a succinct summary of key findings in the conclusion along with concrete recommendations for farmers or agronomists based on the study's results. 7. Conduct a thorough proofreading to eliminate grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistencies in terminology, ensuring that all technical terms are defined upon first use and used consistently throughout the manuscript. <p>With the minor revisions noted for clarity and accuracy, this manuscript has the potential to make a significant contribution to the literature on yield enhancement of Bt cotton through canopy management in rainfed conditions.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>P. Reddypriya</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Professor Jayashankar Telangana Agricultural University, India</p>