



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_61639
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of Gross Margin for Three Varieties of Rice Grown Under Two Planting Methods and Different Weed Control Measures.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Materials and method section, the methodology is well planned and explained, but the materials used in the study is suggested to represent in the tabulated form for a quick and easy view. Also, the list of weedicides used, their source and the dose applied as pre and post emergence are suggested to compile in tabular form of materials and methods section. 2. In results section, the mean values has been calculated for the various parameters but is lacking in other statistical calculations viz., standard error amongst the replications and the comparison amongst the different varieties by using Tukey HSD post hoc test or DMRT for comparing the mean values of treatment. 3. The author is suggested to modify the statistics in the tables, as the data is clearly showing the significant difference amongst the OCR and BCR of different varieties but the significance needs to be calculated on the basis of 'p' and 'F' values by subjecting to the statistical softwares on raw/mother data. Also the presentation of tables can be improved or modify into graphical form 4. The references cited in discussion and introductory sections are little old literature, these are suggested to update with the latest references. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggestion noted and the materials will be tabulated if possible. 2. Opinion well understood and appreciated, but the need to subject the result to further analysis is not necessary since the gross margin analysis is a tool on itself used to determine profitability of a business. Since the result dealing with is in monetary values means that differences among them can easily be understood. Without doubt anywhere two dollars is greater than one dollar without the need to subject them to statistical analysis. 3. Similar to explanation in 2 above, the OCR and BCR are meant to give the differences concerning the performance and worth of the business. So may not need to be subjected to any statistical evaluation again because a fraction difference from their estimation means alot. 4. Reviewer opinion noted and appreciated. The author was only been mindful of the time the data were obtained so using references within that period will be more appropriate than latest refrences due to gap differences and changes over time.
Minor REVISION comments	The author must check the manuscript for proper punctuation of the text as I found many times	Noted and proper check carried out.
Optional/General comments	Authors performed well thought full experiments on comparative analysis of varietal impact of rice, as a part of the research concern. Also the study signifies the importance of cost benefit ratio for the rice cultivation in lowland areas, serving the purpose of weed problem and need based dose for their management. However, few major and minor comments are listed which are queries as a reviewer, that needs to be discussed (improve or modify) before the paper is accepted in this journal.	The author really appreciate the contribution of the reviewer and have done some modification to make the paper better. T he work is quite old but not yet published, so the author believed that the publication will still contributes significantly to body of knowledge as no knowledge is a waste.

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>	No ethical issues.