



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The abstract as presented cannot stand alone. It do not represent adequately the methodology, results and conclusion. The introduction did not highlight the research gaps. The justifications for neither the study nor the objectives were not clearly stated. The materials and methods were very deficient. The sampling plan employed in selecting the farmers was not stated etc. etc. Although the chemical compositions of the organic residues and soil samples from the selected farms were determined but, they were not put to any scientific use in formulating the nutrient management packages. Generally, the paper cannot pass when subjected to rigorous scientific scrutiny. Therefore, it will only be useful as a local extension manual for farmers in the study area.	This section is largely rewritten We have added a section in the penultimate paragraph to address the issue We appreciate the comments of the reviewer. We think this perception is developed due to non-conventional nature of the objective/approach of this article. PLEASE NOTE THAT WE HAVE NOT DISCUSSED THE OUTCOME OF TRIAL ON NUTRIENT PACKAGES IN THIS ARTICLE ITSELF. WE HAVE ONLY APPLIED THE PRINCIPLES OF FPR TO OUTLINE THE METHODOLOGY OF SOURCING NUTRIENTS FOR PARTICULAR FARMING SYSTEMS. However, we have, 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 incomplete. Nevertheless, we have rearranged the write up



SDI Review Form 1.6

		now. We have shifted the soil test, nutrient recommendation and nutrient content in organic inputs to the Methodology Section itself and left the identified nutrient packages under Results and Discussion section. We have also mentioned how these tables are related to the identification of nutrient packages for different farming systems. The reviewer believes that the subject of this paper does not merit a research publication at all. We can only say that this paper is not similar to the mainstream and conventional agronomic trial (be it participatory/non-participatory research) and expecting regular methods and result-discussion is, unfortunately, not guaranteed. In fact, we have also completed the field trials with the identified nutrient packages now, and there will be other publications with a string of agronomic/socio-economic and ecological parameters in future. WE HOPE THAT YOU WILL UNNDERSTAND THE LIMITATION. PLEASE REFER TO THE TRACK CHANGED FILE FOR DETAILS
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		