

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_107576
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Macronutrient and Humic Acid on Physiological Traits in a Fodder Cereal-Pulse Intercropping System
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? <b>YES</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? <b>No</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? <b>No</b></p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? <b>YES</b></p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? <b>No</b></p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>-The manuscript has a potential to be a good article but needs more detailed revisions and corrections</p> <p>-The title mentioned MACRONUTRIENTES but is not really clear in the manuscript why is using Calcium as CaCl<sub>2</sub>. How important was the foliar application of Urea, MAP, and CaCl<sub>2</sub>???? As part of the treatments.</p> <p>-Although in Materials and Methods the Randomized Block Design is mentioned. Nothing is said about the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) or the Analysis of Comparison of Means.</p> <p>-The results of ANOVA must be described in the section of RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</p> <p>-More tables and/or figures are needed to improve the manuscript</p> <p>-In the section of Materials and Methods there is a sentence....."Soil analysis indicated low availability of nitrogen (202 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), medium levels of phosphorus (14 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and potassium (240 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)" ....On what was based that nitrogen level is LOW? Or Phosphorus Medium? Please, add the reference levels or the critical levels according to literature</p> <p>-In conclusions is recommended that the application of humic acid at a rate of 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, coupled with 125% of the recommended dose of fertilizer and foliar application of 1.0% Urea + 0.5% CaCl<sub>2</sub> at 25 and 45 days after sowing was the best treatment....however an <b>economic analysis</b> of Cost-Benefit ratio by using the fodder yield obtained by hectare of both maize and cowpea as compared with the Control can improve the manuscript.</p> <p>-</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? <b>YES</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**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)

**Review Form 1.7**

<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>Jorge Humberto Ramírez Silva</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias, Mexico</b>