

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123653</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of sowing methods and phosphorus levels on Growth, Yield and Economics of Summer Mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)</b>
Type of the 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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is important for its insights into optimizing mungbean cultivation through different sowing methods and phosphorus levels. The research provides practical guidance for improving crop yield and economic returns, particularly in regions where mungbean is a staple. Its clear and methodical approach makes it valuable for both researchers and practitioners in agronomy. While the findings are impactful, a deeper discussion on broader implications could enhance its significance.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>A suggested alternative title could be " Influence of sowing methods and phosphorus levels on growth, yield and economic returns of Summer Mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)"</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract of the article is comprehensive in that it covers the main aspects of the study, including the objectives, methods, key findings, and conclusions. It provides a clear overview of the experiment conducted and highlights the significant results. However, there are a few areas where the abstract could be improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While the abstract mentions that the combination of Bed sowing + 50 kg/ha P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> yielded the highest values, it could benefit from more specific details regarding the magnitude of improvement (e.g., percentage increases in yield or economic returns compared to other treatments). This would provide a clearer picture of the study's impact.</li> <li>- The abstract could be slightly concise to remove redundant phrases or overly detailed descriptions, making it more concise while retaining the essential information.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be generally appropriate. However, here are a few suggestions to ensure the structure is as effective as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The introduction is well-structured but could benefit from a more explicit statement of the research gap or problem that this study aims to address. This would help to clarify the significance of the research from the outset.</li> <li>- Consider ensuring that all methodological details are concise and focused on what is necessary to reproduce the study. Any overly detailed descriptions, such as soil analysis methods, could be briefly summarized or moved to supplementary materials if applicable.</li> <li>- The discussion could be further enhanced by including more interpretation of the results in the context of broader agricultural practices.</li> <li>- The conclusion is concise and summarizes the main findings well. Consider adding a brief mention of potential future research directions or practical applications of the findings to strengthen this section.</li> <li>- Ensure that all figures and tables are well-integrated into the text, with appropriate references in the relevant sections. Each should be clearly labeled and accompanied by descriptive captions.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-designed experimental approach, which includes a randomized block design with appropriate replication to minimize variability and ensure reliable results. The study systematically investigates the effects of different sowing methods and phosphorus levels on multiple growth and yield parameters, providing a comprehensive analysis of the factors influencing summer mungbean productivity. The results are presented with appropriate statistical analysis, reinforcing the validity of the findings. Additionally, the manuscript effectively compares its results with existing literature, demonstrating consistency with or advancements beyond previous research, which further supports its scientific correctness.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>While the references included are generally appropriate, enhancing the manuscript with more recent and diverse sources would improve its scientific rigor and relevance. No specific additional references can be suggested without access to the latest databases, but these general areas for expansion should guide further literature review and citation.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well-structured and suitable for scholarly communication, though it would benefit from minor language improvements and the inclusion of more recent references. Visual aids like additional charts or graphs could enhance data presentation. Discussing the practical implications and sustainability aspects of the findings would add value and relevance. Acknowledging study limitations and suggesting future research directions could provide a more balanced and impactful contribution.	

### 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>Ruchuon Wanna</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Maharakham University, Thailand</b>