

ARPG Review form

Journal Name	Journal of Agriculture and Crops
--------------	----------------------------------

Does this article meet the scope of this journal?

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

This form will be used for reviews of submitted research articles.

1. Introduction: Does the first paragraph serve as a good introduction?*

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Suggest, if possible, ways to improve the introduction.*

In 2nd paragraphs: It's more appropriate to plant rice, not corn. Then, there are relevant references that need to be added.

3. Structure: Rate the author's line of argumentation.*

Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>
Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Average	<input type="checkbox"/>
Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Editing: Did you find any problems with:*

Grammar	<input type="checkbox"/>
Punctuation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spelling	<input type="checkbox"/>
Word use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

5. Comments per Section of Manuscript

<i>General comment:</i>	<i>All constructive comments by the authors, must be professionally revised by the authors. Pay attention to all the highlighted chapters, then correct them based on the recommended script file.</i>
<i>Review of literature</i>	<i>This section is not in the manuscript, so there is no need for revision.</i>

ARPG Review form

Methodology:	2.1. Study sites: It is better to complement the chemical properties of the soil: pH, CEC, N-total, P available and total, K available and total, etc. Not only ecological traits. 2.2. Land preparation, experimental design and treatments: Please consider adding references: e.g. Darma et al. (2022). 2.3. Data collection and analysis: Writing consistency of ton/ha.
Results:	3.1. Rice paddy yield: The importance of the description of CropLiftBio so that it affects rice yields. In addition, Tables 2 – 9 do not contain columns, but only explain a few sentences. This should be carefully revised.
Discussion:	Nothing.
Policy Suggestion	It is not entirely clear, where the conclusions and recommendations section does not discuss the implications and contributions to reviewing the study weaknesses that are important to be discussed in the follow-up agenda.
Bibliography/References:	There are still references such as journals, which do not include numbers (series) and doi links/urls.
Others:	Abstract: Some words (symbols and units) should be corrected.
Decision:	Needs improvement.

6. Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = Poor)

Contribution to the Field:	1
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity of Presentation :	2
Depth of Research:	2

SECTION V - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark with an X)

Accept As It Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	
Requires Moderate Revision:	X
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit To Another Publication Such As:	
Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):	

ARPG Review form

Note: Would you like to review again the paper after receiving the revised file from the author?

Yes	
No	x