

Review Form 1.7

Magazine name:	Journal of International Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript number:	Mrs_JEAI_113128
Manuscript title:	Effect of legume-legume replacement series of intercropping system on growth, yield and quality of chickpea
Item type	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review comments

	reviewer comment	Author's Comment (If you agree with the reviewer, please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory for authors to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences about this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the article summary complete?</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript reveals: The UNESCO THESAURUS is a universal glossary that allows the study to be located in a specific spectrum of sciences: Agriculture – Cultivation – Chickpea... The background is relevant as is the problem statement and its justification. The randomized block design is relevant for this type of study; the selected population is ideal to obtain expected results; The study environment contributes to the research in a significant way. The formula to use for reading results is not indicated. The results use a universal System of Units accessible for interpretation. These are compared with other results obtained by research, revealing new findings that are an important contribution to the cultivation of this product. It would be interesting to propose future lines of research based on these findings. By not having the objective of the research, its conclusions cannot be assessed.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate to the research presented.</p> <p>3. There is no objective of the research. The methodology is relevant as its results. In this section it is necessary to indicate the main conclusions reached with the research.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article contains the elements required by the academy with some weaknesses in some sections that must be taken into account.</p> <p>5. The article is partially complete. It is important to take into account the references that support the research praxis.</p> <p>6. The references are weak in their updating and it is recommended to review them. Furthermore, it should be taken into account that these support the findings found, so it is suggested that they be at least 40 -50. However, the Journal's requirement must be taken into account.</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Comments</p> <p>1. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for academic communications?</p>	<p>Appropriate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador