



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_23178
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF COWDUNG, NPK AND RHIZOBIUM INOCULA ON NODULES NUMBER, YIELD CONTRIBUTING ATTRIBUTES AND YIELD OF SUMMER MUNGBEAN (<i>Vigna radiata</i>) IN ACID SOIL
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The manuscript is well written. This study was conducted to see the effect of cowdung, NPK and <i>Rhizobium</i> inocula on nodules number, yield contributing attributes and yield of summer mungbean (var. Binamoog-8), in acid soil at the farm of Agricultural Training Institute, Khadim Nagar, Sylhet from April to July, 2014. I think that Introduction is understandable, clear and comprehensive exposing the reader to the topic. The author must make the following correction: <i>The author must delete the names of the authors of the citations 3 and 4, and only leave mentioned numbers 3 and 4 of the appointment.</i> Material and Methods. OK. Very complete writing. The methodology used is correctly described. So described it allow experiment to be reproduced. Results and Discussion: OK. I think the experimental results are thoroughly and logically interpreted in the discussion and presented with clarity. Author compared the results obtained with the experiments and results of previous studies on the relevant subject. <i>However, I believe that the author should discuss further the results obtained with the citations mentioned, especially points 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7.</i> The author must make the following correction: The author must delete the names of the authors of the citations 8, 9, 18 and 19, and only leave mentioned numbers 8, 9, 18 and 19 of the appointment.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	When a citation that is mentioned in internet, the author must mention the date consulted (cited 5).	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Some corrections should be done on the content and form before its publication.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Petigrosso Lucas Ricardo
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata, Argentina