

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_122406</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Phytotoxic Effect of Paperboard Effluent on Seed Germination and Seedling Growth of Gingelly Crop (Sesamum indicum L. Var. VRI 4)</b>
Type of the Article	

### 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>
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 makes a significant contribution to the scientific community, especially in addressing the critical issue of water sustainability in agriculture. The detailed tables offer comprehensive data that effectively supports the research findings, while the descriptive diagrams clearly illustrate complex concepts, enhancing the overall understanding. However, the introduction section would benefit from additional information to provide better context and background, setting a stronger foundation for the study. Moreover, incorporating more recent citations would strengthen the manuscript by connecting the research to the latest developments in the field. Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and offers valuable insights for advancing sustainable agricultural practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is descriptive and effectively communicates the key elements of your research.	
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 concise, highlighting the most important points of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article is well-structured with sections and subsections.	
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 demonstrates a high level of scientific correctness, as it is grounded in rigorous methodology and supported by well-validated data. The authors have thoroughly addressed relevant literature, ensuring that the study is built upon a solid theoretical foundation. The experimental design and statistical analyses are appropriate for the research questions posed, lending credibility to the findings. Additionally, the results are clearly presented, with logical interpretations that align well with the data, making the manuscript both scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I suggest adding more recent references.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The use of the English language was appropriate. I advise revising the manuscript and correcting some grammar and syntax errors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>	No ethical issues

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Anthoula Gleridou</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece</b>