

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_128290
Title of the Manuscript:	INTERGRATED CROP MANAGEMENT IN NIGER FOR HIGHER PRODUCTIVITY IN HILL AND TRIBAL AREAS OF ANDHRA PRADESH, INDIA
Type of the 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 (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Here the authors studied Intergrated crop management in niger for higher productivity in hill and tribal areas of Andhra Pradesh. This is exclusively a field study result. Though it present some varietal performance comparisons, but there should be some improvements made prior to final publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Mostly, but it can be more concise	
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.	Not so comprehensive. The following points should be considered- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background, justification, and objective of the study is not clear • Many abbreviations in abstract should be elaborated in first use. • Concluding remarks should be clearer. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Mostly correct as per the design of the trials.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More references should be added for the betterment of the overall article. The following references should be added for further improvement of the contents- Chowhan, S., Islam, M., Rana, M. S., Khan, N. A., Jahan Ali, M. K., Ahmed, N. U., & Rahman, M. M. 2023a. Growth and development patterns in Mustard (Brassica spp.) as influenced by sowing time. Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences, 11(2), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.18006/2023.11(2).325.338 Chowhan, S., Islam, M., Rana, M.S. , Sultana, M.R. , Ghosh, S.R. , Ahmmed, F. , Ferdous, H.M., Ali, M.I., Khan, N.A. and Rahman, M.M. 2023b. Optimum and late sowing of mustard varieties show similar seed yield. Plant Science Today. 10(2): 382–392. https://doi.org/10.14719/pst.2246 Chowhan, S. 2022. Scope of Mustard Cultivation for Meeting Edible Oil Crisis Due to Russia Ukraine War. Acta Scientific Agriculture, 6 (10): 22-23. https://doi.org/10.31080/ASAG.2022.06.1185	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Mostly	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I recommend using a map showing the study site. • Discussion part should be improved. • It is not cleat what is the difference between Table 2a and Table 2b? I think this two table presents same type of data. If so, they can be merged into one table • I don't see any relevancy in using Table 3 in the Results and discussion part, as it only lists trainings. 	

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:	Sushan Chowhan
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture, Bangladesh