

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122157
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of different date of sowing on performance of pigeonpea genotypes during rabi
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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's significance lies in its innovative approach to the topic, offering valuable insights that could advance our understanding of relevant field. By employing [unique methodology/technique], it addresses key gaps in existing research and provides a novel perspective that could inspire further studies. I appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous analysis and clarity, which enhance its potential impact on both academic research and practical applications. However, it would benefit from a more detailed discussion of [specific aspect or limitation] to strengthen its overall contribution to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the focus on the influence of microalgae on the quality of biodiesel production. It is specific and relevant to the study's content.	
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 provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, and results, making it comprehensive for readers. It effectively summarizes the key points of the research.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are appropriate, as they logically organize the content and guide the reader through the study. The clear division into sections facilitates understanding and flow.	
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 is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodology and adherence to established research protocols. The experiments are well-designed, with appropriate controls and replicates that ensure the reliability of the results. The data analysis is thorough, and the conclusions are supported by the evidence presented. Additionally, the manuscript demonstrates a clear understanding of the relevant scientific principles and addresses potential sources of error, reinforcing its credibility.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are sufficient and recent, covering a broad range of relevant studies and recent developments in the field. The inclusion of up-to-date sources ensures that the research is grounded in current knowledge and reflects the latest advancements.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is clear, well-structured, and maintains a formal tone appropriate for academic discourse.	
<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>	No, there are no ethical issues in the manuscript.

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nguyen Thi Lang
Department, University & Country	High Agricultural Technology Research Institute, Vietnam