

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_122405
Title of the Manuscript:	“Interaction effect of various establishment methods and solid and liquid organic manures on growth of finger millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.)”
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (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.	Research area is good because ragi will respond well towards organic sources. Ragi will respond well with a particular establishment method during that season. Hence, the topic chosen is appropriate and the outcome of the research is also useful to the farming community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes – small change is required	
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.	Has to improve. Can write the treatments clearly indicating the best treatment as the treatments are more	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Can write elaborately with regard to growth parameters in results and discussion	
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.	In most of the areas the connectivity is missing for giving clear understanding of the results. Manuscript can be modified according to the suggestions to make understand. Please check the data that in plant height 40 DAS and 80DAS it is showing non-significant except significant in the year 2022. Regarding growth parameters plant height is proportional to Dry weight. Whereas in dry weight it shows non significant at 80DAS please check.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References cited are old and has to be replaced with recent ones i.e from 2020-2024. Some of the references were not relevant pl check and mention the crop in which research was conducted.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Connectivity of sentences has to check	
Optional/General comments	The above corrections are verymuch required.	

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:	B. Rajendra Kumar
Department, University & Country	ANGRAU, India