

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_123280
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF CONSERVATION AGRICULTURE AND HYDROGEL ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MAIZE
Type of the Article	

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.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides insights into sustainable agricultural practices by examining the impact of tillage and hydrogel on maize yield. It offers valuable data that can help optimize water usage and improve crop productivity, which is vital for addressing food security and resource conservation challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of Tillage Practices and Hydrogel Applications on Yield and Yield Attributing Traits of Maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) over the Years	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is almost comprehensive, but I would like to suggest adding the location of the study, like a state name. And also suggests mentioning the effect of the study on yield-attributing traits.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes appropriate	
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 study was planned with a split-plot design, but the data analysis did not follow the design, such as the missing interaction between the effects of the main plot and subplot. The interaction between years was also absent, which is to be pooled anova between years, which is also absent in result.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Neither sufficient nor recent	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes suitable	
Optional/General comments	Discussion part is very poor and suitable supporting reference are also very less	

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahaveer Prasad Ola
Department, University & Country	Vivekananda Global University, India