

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116793
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient balance and nutrient use efficiency of irrigated pigeon pea [<i>Cajanus cajan</i> (L.) Millsp.] under various integrated nutrient management practices
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript, the research, and the results are useful for the scientific world, in the sense of covering some avenues of investigation or confirming others. For this reason, the comments and conclusions must be developed in the sense of addressing not only the farmers directly applying one or more of the treatments, but also the researchers in the sense of new objectives, and ways to continue.</p> <p>2. Yes the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure and the subsections of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. As a general structure, the manuscript is scientifically correct. In detail, however, there are a series of deficiencies that must be remedied in a major revision:</p> <p>5.1 There are basic notions that must be clearly defined through formulas and notations, not just through the heads of tables): nutrient balance, agronomic efficiency, nutrient use efficiency. The formula and the source of the formula must be specified to define an acceptable formal working framework. It should also be specified what the authors mean by RDF, N, eq vermicompost or farmyard manure treatment, that is, equivalence must be defined.</p> <p>5.2 A map with the location of the experimental field in India and possibly a GIS image is recommended.</p> <p>5.3 Missing: - a sketch of the parcelling of the experimental field; - the dimensions of the plots; - the way to isolate the parcels; Experimental evidence is missing: photos of the experimental field in various stages of the culture's evolution on different treatments, comparative photos (see [1,2] from additional references). There are no images for soil data collection and initial soil data (average initial chemical composition).</p> <p>5.4 There are no graphical representations that facilitate and increase the speed of understanding the interpretations and conclusions (see the graphical representations suggested by the reviewer at the end of the text).</p> <p>5.5 It is recommended to check all the interpretations and table headers (measurement units) in the context of some graphic representations for which there is enough space in the work because the work is short.</p> <p>It is recommended to check all the interpretations and table headers (measurement units) in the context of some graphic representations for which there is enough space in the work because the work is short.</p> <p>6.The references are sufficient and recent. I did not find the citations of works 2 and 12 in the list of references in the text of the manuscript.</p> <p>Additional references</p> <p>[1] canola crops, n,p,k fertilizers, chemical and manure - Search Images (bing.com) [2] (PDF) Canola production and effect on soil chemical properties in response to different residue levels from three biannual crop rotations (researchgate.net)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The English language (UK, US or India) must be corrected with the facilities of the text editor or specialized free programs or higher versions, for example, Grammarly, QuillBot, etc.). There are many typical errors. I indicated them only in the reviewed manuscript. For better quality scientific language, it is recommended to use the QuillBot paraphrasing program, free version or higher.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments	Considering the scientific shortcomings (especially those related to the experimental evidence, see 5.) and the language corrections, I gave a grade of 6 with the requirement of a major revision. The article can be expanded with images and graphic representations. After the review, a new review is recommended.	
----------------------------------	---	--

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	The National Institute of Research, Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, INMA Bucharest, Romania