



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_29340
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmer Participatory Research for Development of Crop-specific Nutrient Management Practice under Organic Farming System
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The manuscript reports a study case for a specific area but methodology is interesting and extendable to other location. Cited reference support the methodology used in the manuscript Clearly indicate the objective of the study at the end of the Introduction paragraph. The approach was correctly set down and implemented but sometimes the manuscript methodology and results are often mixed so that reading is not always simple and clear. Please revise. Tables editing is required.	Regarding the perceived mingling of Methodology and Results: We think this perception is developed due to different/non-conventional objective/approach of this article. WE HAVE NOT TRIALED NUTRIENT PACKAGES IN THIS ARTICLE. WE HAVE APPLIED THE PRINCIPLES OF FPR TO OUTLINE THE METHODOLOGY OF SOURCING NUTRIENTS FOR PARTICULAR FARMING SYSTEMS. However, we have also changed the title of the article a bit to address this issue. The identified packages will be put under trial in future. In this article we have just described the method through which farm-specific nutrient sourcing have been identified through farmers' participation. That is why the materials and method section seems to be mixed. We understand that Table 8a and 8b are only directly relevant to the Results section. We have rearranged the write up now. We have shifted the soil test, crop-specific nutrient recommendation and nutrient content in organic inputs to the Methodology Section itself and left the identified nutrient packages (Table 8a & 8b) under Results and Discussion section. Editing is done on several tables to suite author guidelines



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 1 line 14-15 and 16-17: repetition Page 1 line 1620 (abstract results): this is a description of the methodology used is not a results presentation. Page 1 line 23 (keywords): Keywords are usually different from terms used in the title Page 2 line 47-49 and page 3 line 51-54: repetition Page 3 line 69: substitute "requisite" with "required" Page 5 line 99: add "Farming" after "(c)" Page 7 line 135-136: substitute "foliar feeding" with "foliar application" and "soil feeding" with "soil supply" Page 7 line 139: substitute "or" with a "," before "FYM" Page 8 line 156: indicate a reference to table 3 a and b. Page 11 line 168: correct the term "acidic" with "acid" Table 7: what do the * and ** refer to....please explain. For greengram substitute the – with : in the N:P:K dose	Changes made accordingly, please refer to the manuscript with track changes PLEASE REFER TO THE TRACK CHANGED FILE FOR DETAILS
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	English is generally good, but a further revision is suggested. Please check punctuation all over the manuscript.	