



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_42766
Title of the Manuscript:	Yield, quality and soil fertility as influenced by rabi castor (<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.) based intercropping 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>)

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	Language is poor. Poor punctuations. The data were not statistically analysed, inferences without statistical analysis has no value. Castor equivalent yield and LER not worked out. Conclusion has no practical utility, most results are well known. Abstract needs revision. Whole manuscript needs revision.	Sir as per your valuable suggestion I incorporated all thing and accordingly rewrite the result, discussion and also incorporate the castor equivalent yield and land equivalent ration. Whole manuscript get revised As per your/reviewer's suggestion, incorporate all correction in our manuscript and rewrite accordingly and also revise the introduction, M & M, results, conclusion and reference a if further correction is needed I correct the artical.
Minor REVISION comments	Indicated in the manuscript. Not clarified whether the intercropping was additive or replacement series?	Intercrop are sown in additive series which are write in material method
Optional/General comments		