

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127384
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TILLAGE AND NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT AND NUTRIENT CONTENT OF SOYBEAN ( <i>Glycine max L.</i> ) IN THE NORTH WESTERN HIMALAYAS
Type of the Article	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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	The authors have attempted field experiments to improve the yield of soybean and focussed to perform nutritional parameters that can actually reduce malnutrition and food scarcity.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	I suggest the author to correct the title: STUDIES ON MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON GROWTH, DEVELOPMENT, TILLAGE AND NPK CONTENT OF SOYBEAN (Glycine max L.) IN THE NORTH WESTERN HIMALAYAS.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is the first section which readers read. Please re-write the abstract and mention the full form of abbreviations.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes	
<b>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.</b>	Field experiments are more laborious work to do and required more time, patience to perform experiment and to tabulate and record the data.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language quality is good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The authors should mentioned the detailed methodology of Jackson 1973, number of total pods assessed for each plot. The photographs are lacking I would suggest the authors to add field photos, pods photos to authenticate the experiment performed.	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Naziya Banu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Of Mysore, India</b>