

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript, while addressing a relevant topic, lacks depth in its analysis and could benefit from a more rigorous methodology. The limited scope and insufficient data weaken its overall contribution to the scientific community. Additionally, the manuscript's findings are not well-supported, making it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from the work.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>"Impact of Establishment Methods and Organic Manures on the Growth of Finger Millet (<i>Eleusine coracana</i> L.)"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Check comments in the manuscript</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript includes well-defined subsections that help organize the content and guide the reader through different aspects of the research, such as objectives, methodology, results, and discussion. • The results section might be poorly organized or difficult to interpret. The data could be presented in a disjointed manner, with insufficient explanations or context, making it challenging to grasp the main findings. • The discussion may not adequately connect the results with existing literature or provide a comprehensive analysis. There could be a lack of critical interpretation, making it difficult to understand the implications of the findings. • The conclusion may be weak or not effectively summarize the key findings. It might not address the practical implications of the research or offer meaningful recommendations for future studies. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound due to its comprehensive approach in evaluating the interaction effects of various establishment methods and organic manures on finger millet growth. The use of a split-split plot design with multiple treatment combinations and replicates ensures a rigorous experimental setup, enhancing the reliability of the results. The detailed reporting of growth parameters across two years provides a thorough understanding of the effects and supports the validity of the findings. Additionally, the inclusion of statistical analysis and comparison of different treatments reflects a methodical approach, contributing to the overall scientific credibility of the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>uSggestions for additional references might include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recent meta-analyses on the effectiveness of organic manures in improving crop yield and quality. 2. Studies focusing on the impact of different establishment methods on crop performance, specifically for finger millet or similar crops. 3. Key reviews or research articles that discuss the role of sustainable agriculture practices in the context of climate change and food security 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are minor grammatical errors and punctuation issues that could be corrected for better readability. Some sentences are complex and could be simplified to ensure that the ideas are communicated clearly and concisely.	
Optional/General comments	Use Grammerly available online	

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:	Vasanthkumar SS
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India