

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122647
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of New Varietal demonstrations to improve the Productivity and sustainability in Rice
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

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 manuscript will serve as a base for other researchers. I like the idea of the manuscript. But, I did not like the way it is written. Specially the way the tables located on the manuscript is not appropriate for me. The methodology is some how good with minor modifications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. I suggest it to be modified as "Impact of Varietal demonstrations on the Productivity and sustainability in Rice at.... ". Because the demonstration is held for the farmers variety as well. And the study has to be included	
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.	It is not. Addition of some other results, objectives, conclusions, recommendations and key words is mandatory to make it comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	With minor modifications as indicated on the main manuscript yes.	
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.	Scientifically it is correct and has all parts. But it needs the addition/ correction of the comments indicated on the main paper. The discussion part is missed for me. This is a research article and should have a strong discussion.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	They are recent but not sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please correct the manuscript based on the suggestions and comments given on the main document.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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:	Endalkachew Baye
Department, University & Country	Salale University, Ethiopia