

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_127630
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of varietal selection and plant spacing patterns on the growth of maize (Zea mays L.) In irrigated agro-eco-systems of Punjab
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study provides valuable insights into optimizing maize production in Punjab's irrigated agro-ecosystems. By analyzing the combined effects of varietal selection and plant spacing, the research contributes to the efficient use of resources and enhanced crop productivity. The results offer practical implications for farmers and agronomists to improve yield and sustainability, aligning with broader goals of agricultural intensification.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear, specific, and reflective of the study's content. No changes are necessary.	
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 effectively summarizes the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. However, it could be improved by adding quantitative highlights of the results, such as specific yield differences among treatments, to provide a more compelling snapshot of the study's impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The use of a split-plot design and statistical analysis is appropriate for the study's objectives. The conclusions are well-supported by the data presented	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and recent. However, including more global studies on maize spacing and varietal impacts could enhance the manuscript's academic depth. Suggested additions include studies on maize response to environmental variables and advanced agronomic practices.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is adequate for scholarly communication but could benefit from minor editing to enhance clarity and conciseness.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript's discussion section could better compare its findings with similar studies, highlighting global relevance. Figures and tables are informative but could benefit from clearer labels and captions for better standalone readability	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Praveenkumar P
Department, University & Country	Anna University, India