

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129919
Title of the Manuscript:	Planting date and spacing optimization for Kaempferia galanga L.
Type of the Article	Journal

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 manuscript provides valuable insights into optimizing agronomic practices for <i>Kaempferia galanga</i> L., an economically and medicinally significant crop. The findings contribute to improving the crop's productivity and oil yield, addressing the growing demand for its rhizomes in the medicinal and culinary industries. The study also fills a critical gap in standardized cultivation practices, which is highly beneficial for farmers and researchers in tropical regions. By analyzing three years of experimental data, this research offers robust evidence that could guide sustainable agricultural practices for this underutilized crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and informative, reflecting the study's core objectives. However, to enhance precision and attract a wider audience, an alternative title could be: " <i>Optimizing Planting Date and Spacing for Enhanced Yield and Oil Production of Kaempferia galanga L.: A Field Experiment.</i> "	
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 provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including its objectives, methods, key results, and conclusions. However, it could benefit from explicitly mentioning the statistical significance of findings and the practical implications for farmers. Consider adding a sentence on the broader implications for sustainable agriculture or pharmaceutical industries.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with appropriate experimental design and statistical analysis. The split-plot design and three-year data collection strengthen the reliability of the results. However, further discussion on potential limitations, such as variations in environmental factors or soil nutrient management, could enhance the study's robustness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are relevant and but not sufficient, some recent studies on agronomic practices for related rhizomatous crops could be added to strengthen the context. Consider including references on advanced agronomic modeling or recent pharmacological studies related to <i>K. galanga</i> .	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear and suitable for scholarly communication. Minor grammatical improvements and rephrasing for conciseness could further enhance readability. For instance, simplifying overly technical sentences in the introduction might improve accessibility to a broader audience.	
Optional/General comments	The tables provide valuable data, but adding visual aids such as bar charts or line graphs to represent trends in rhizome yield and oil production across planting dates and spacing would improve data interpretation	

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:	Bukade Adesina
Department, University & Country	Purdue University, USA