

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124731
Title of the Manuscript:	Maximizing teff productivity: cutting-edge agronomic strategies for improved growth and nutrient uptake in eastern dry zone of Karnataka
Type of the Article	

#### 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 explores an essential agronomic strategy to maximize the productivity of teff, a significant crop for drought-prone areas. The study is timely and relevant, considering the growing global interest in teff as a gluten-free, climate-resilient crop. Its focus on optimizing planting geometry and nutrient management offers potential solutions to improve crop productivity and sustainability in dry zones. Nevertheless, while the research has practical applications, the manuscript could be polished for a clearer scientific contribution.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Maximizing teff productivity: cutting-edge agronomic strategies for improved growth and nutrient uptake in eastern dry zone of Karnataka," is slightly broad and could benefit from more specificity. I suggest an alternative title as: " <a href="#">Optimizing Planting Geometry and Nutrient Management to Enhance Teff Productivity in eastern dry zone of Karnataka.</a> "	
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 comprehensive but could be streamlined to focus on key findings and methods. It includes detailed information on specific nutrient uptake and spacing, but this could overwhelm readers. I suggest condensing the background information on the design and focusing more on the results and implications, particularly regarding the practical outcomes (yield improvements) and broader impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure of the manuscript is generally appropriate, but some sections lack clarity. For instance, the "Materials and Methods" section could benefit from breaking down subsections to improve readability. Additionally, the introduction contains too much background on teff. It should briefly introduce the crop and move faster into the research gaps and objectives.	
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 presents scientifically sound and technically correct research. The experimental design, data collection, and analysis methods are appropriate for this study. However, more emphasis on the statistical analysis results is required to demonstrate the robustness of the findings. For example, further discussion on how the findings align with or differ from existing literature would enhance its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references seem adequate but somewhat outdated. More recent studies from the last five years will strengthen the manuscript, particularly regarding advances in teff research or agronomy in similar crops.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The language is clear but can be improved for flow and scholarly tone. Some sentences are complex and could be simplified. Also, tables are comprehensive, but adding more explanations within the text to interpret them would help readers grasp the significance of the results.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The manuscript is scientifically relevant but needs refinement in language and clarity. It could be considered for publication in the prescribed journal with minor revisions. The revisions should rely on streamlining the abstract and introduction, clarifying the statistical analysis, and updating references.</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Dickson Utonga</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tengeru Institute of Community Development, Tanzania</b>