

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_127066
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of cow-based preparations with mulching on weed count, dry matter and nodulation in chickpea under wheat + chickpea intercropping system
Type of the Article	

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	Mulching lowers soil evaporation, preserves moisture, regulates soil temperature, inhibits weed development, and enhances microbial activity thereby increasing the yield of the crops.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of cow-based preparations and mulching on weed management and nodulation in chickpea under intercropping system	
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?	The conclusion part is missing	
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.	In material and method kindly mention the number of replications taken for the experiment. Weed control efficiency (%) should also have been calculated to get the accurate results	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Accepted	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Monika Ray
Department, University & Country	Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology, India