

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121017
Title of the Manuscript:	Impacts of varying sowing dates on the profitability and production of cultivars of Pigeonpea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i> L. Mill sp.).
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript is about food production. Food is the ultimate energy source for scientists. Abundance of energy is the best biological state for scientists. I like this manuscript for I have flair for food processing.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No; the subsections should be joined so as to have a block paragraph scientific report of the manuscript.	
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.	The manuscript here is not scientifically correct. However, its correctness should only be looked upon when the reviewer's comments/corrections are judiciously effected. Also, its robustness and technicality will also be proven at the time the corrections are effected.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The scope/ coverage of the manuscript from the author (s) perspective made them to be okay, but, Tripathi <i>et al.</i> , 1975 is too old for the manuscript, and can be replaced with more recent one. Most importantly, let all the references that are in the manuscript also appear in the reference section. NB* The reference ZoteAshalate, 2011 do not appear in the manuscript, but appeared in the reference section-expunge.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is okay, the reason is that English language is the second language of the author (s).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Michael Olisa Nwankwo
Department, University & Country	Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Nigeria