

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_125788 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Yield and Economics under High Density Planting System in Cotton in Kachchh District of Gujarat |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| 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. | This manuscript is important because it shows how high-density planting can improve cotton yield and profits. I like how it clearly explains the benefits for both crop growth and farm income. The study also provides useful insights on closing yield gaps and helping farmers adopt better practices. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | <p>The current title, "Assessment of Yield and Economics under High Density Planting System in Cotton in Kachchh District of Gujarat," is generally suitable as it clearly describes the focus on yield and economic outcomes of high-density planting in cotton within a specific region. However, it could be made more concise and engaging.</p> <p>Suggested Alternative Title: "Evaluating Cotton Yield and Profitability with High-Density Planting in Gujarat's Kachchh District"</p> <p>This revised title maintains the key details but is more succinct and highlights the study's focus on both yield and profitability.</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. | The abstract is well-rounded, but a few changes could improve it. It would benefit from specifying the study's duration (2017-2020) and area covered (12 hectares) for clearer context. Adding a brief mention of the environmental benefit, like reduced soil water evaporation, would emphasize HDPS's sustainability. Simplifying technical terms and including key statistics, such as the 13.35% yield increase and benefit-cost ratio, could make the abstract more concise and accessible. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes, the manuscript's structure is appropriate and follows a logical flow. The sections are well-organized, making the study easy to follow. Adding subheadings within the "Results and Discussion" section would improve clarity, and a separate conclusion section could highlight key takeaways more effectively. | |
| 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. | The manuscript is scientifically accurate and well-designed, using reliable methods like multi-year frontline demonstrations to compare high-density planting with traditional cotton methods. The analysis is thorough and supports the findings with clear data on yield and economic benefits. The study aligns with existing research, making it a solid contribution to sustainable cotton farming practices. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references included are generally sufficient, though some are somewhat dated. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is clear, concise, and well-structured, with accurate terminology that aligns with academic standards. | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

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> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Name: | Muhammad Ali Shah |
| Department, University & Country | Guangxi University, China |