

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125016
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of fertigation of water soluble fertilizers on growth, yield of cowpea and nutrients availability in soil under rice-cowpea cropping sequence
Type of the Article	

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.	Authors have tried to find out best fertilizer management practices under rice-cowpea system by including number of combinations with the aim to maintaining soil fertility and getting profitable crop harvest. This study will add the knowledge into scientific community regarding fertile management in a specific agroclimatic situation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable	
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.	Findings in the abstract are not matching with the data shown in the table "Significant higher organic carbon (0.57 %) was recorded with the application 100% STCR dose with WSF through fertigation at 8 DI and same treatment was also recorded the higher available N (146.38 kg N ha ⁻¹), P ₂ O ₅ (122.67 kg P ₂ O ₅ ha ⁻¹) and K ₂ O (130.17 kg K ₂ O ha ⁻¹) content in soil at 4 DI" recheck this and correct accordingly. Units of micronutrients mg/ha is incorrect correct this as mg/kg	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Manuscript is structured but need to improved 1. Introduction of the article is not well structured and not have clearly defined research questions to which researchers are trying to address. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At sudden introduction jumps to "Surface flooding method of irrigation, commonly practiced by the farmers in <u>this region</u>, is expensive since it causes high water loss. Drip or sprinkler irrigations may prove efficient over surface irrigation method". And no mention about the region before this sentence. Most of the instruction is on irrigation/ water use efficiency however from the title it is expected in the line of productivity of rice-cowpea system, soil fertility and soil health and quality. This is suggested to restructure the introduction and formulate the research objectives 2. A brief paragraph about ago-ecology of the study area is expected in the materials and methods 3. Results and discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to be thoroughly checked the results in the manuscript with data provided in the tables Homogenous units to be used throughout the MS. In few places ppm is mentioned and at some places mg/kg Discussion part of the manuscript need to be improved. In your conclusion you should tell which treatment is best in maintaining or improving soil fertility. 	
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"> Manuscript shows scientific background in finding best fertilizer management for rice-cowpea system. It will be better to compare the system productivity (rice + rice equivalent yield of cowpea) in economic terms rather just showing the yield of cowpea. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are good in number; however, it is suggested to replace some of older with recent references.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is good but suggested to shorten the sentences where is too long and check for grammatical correctness.	
Optional/General comments	A major revision is suggested before acceptance of this MS.	

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:	K. K. Mourya
Department, University & Country	India