

**Review Form 3**

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

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The relevance of this manuscript is good because comparing the nexus between sowing date and the profitability is very crucial for the scientific community. But to undertake an impact study we need to see data from different years .In a year we are unable to see the impact on the profitability of the cultivars.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is better if it is modified as ;The nexus between sowing date and the profitability of the Pigeonpea cultivars	
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.	<p>The abstract needs modification;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially it lacks introduction,</li> <li>• The gap that this study wants to fill is not clearly stated</li> <li>• The objective of the study and the methodology used is not clearly stated</li> <li>• The conclusion is to shallow and It doesn't include the recommendations based on the finding ; for the readers or anyone in need of reading the paper/further information</li> </ul>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>It is somewhat good but when we go to the conclusion part there are table which indicate the finding of the research but it is good to put those tables either in the annex part or before the conclusion .</p> <p>There is no recommendation of the author</p>	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The manuscript is new – thus not previously published</li> <li>• There is no plagiarism and ethically correct</li> <li>•</li> <li>• But Results are not well written, i.e., it should have a fluent narrative, have no good graphics, and also be correct in the citing of work of other scientists</li> <li>• Lacks suitable interpretation and supporting of other researchers</li> </ul>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :-	<p>The references are sufficient but some references are not up to date meaning the author used old references so better to avoid old references. Like; Chauhan Y. S, Venkatraman, N. and Sheldarke, A. R. 1987; Akinola J. O. and A. Ocjola. 1994; Reddy Govind, M. B. C. Ghosh and N Sudhakar. 1991; Tripathi, R. D., G. P. Srivastva, M. C Mishra and C. S. Sinha. 1975.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Somewhat good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to see your methodologies in detail in the abstract part</li><li>• Clearly state the gap that forced the researcher to undertake this research</li><li>• Its better if you add your conclusion and recommendation's based on your findings</li><li>• The research is done before 9 years so how do you see the timeliness of the paper? through time different conditions other than sowing dates may influence this research</li><li>• Avoid old citations</li><li>• In the result and discussion part explain in detail and avoid jargon words</li><li>• How did you calculate profitability checkup ratios these like benefit cost ratio etc...? I didn't see anything related with these points in the meth ology part</li><li>• Had no enough graphics to attract the readers</li></ul>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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>Tigist Kefale Mekonen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Debre Markos University, Ethiopia</b>