

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_128542
Title of the Manuscript:	Pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i> (L.) Millsp) based cropping systems for sustainable production - a comprehensive review
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I have no doubt with regard to its importance, it's timely and relevant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	it's acceptable by me.	
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.	It ends with "So what?" I haven't seen any recommendation.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It's difficult to say it's scientifically correct, since there are a lot of limitations within, as indicted in the text. Since it's a review, it's expected to review so many literatures done in the area, but it couldn't. Some of them include but not limited to: citation problem, lack of consistency, and I haven't seen any clear objective.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No, they are not. It's clearly indicated that there are insufficient and too old references in the text.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Not bad.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Gebreslasie Gebrekidan Beyene
Department, University & Country	Tigray Agricultural Research Institute (TARI), Ethiopia