

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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 <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.	This manuscript is highly relevant to the scientific community as it presents innovative agronomic strategies to maximize teff productivity, an essential crop in dry regions. The results of the experiment provide valuable perspectives on nutrient management and planting geometry, which can be applied to improve food security and agricultural sustainability. Furthermore, the research contributes to the understanding of the interactions between agronomic factors and nutrient uptake, which is essential for developing more effective agricultural practices. I appreciate this manuscript for its practical approach and quantitative data, which provide a solid foundation for future research in the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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 presents the entire structure coherently.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodological approach, which includes a well-structured experimental design and the use of appropriate data analysis techniques. The research was conducted in a controlled environment, ensuring the validity of the results and the possibility of replication in other contexts. Furthermore, the presented data is accompanied by detailed statistical analyses, which strengthen confidence in the conclusions. However, in the discussion of the results, some adjustments are needed. Additionally, the conclusions could be more specific, highlighting clear recommendations for future research and agricultural practices.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Ok.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments	Yes.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uasley Caldas de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	State University of Mato Grosso, Brazil