



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17065
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Bioinorganic Combinations on Yield, Quality and Economics of Mungbean
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	1) In Part 1. Introduction - the goal of the paper is missed. In 2.1. Experimental site, there is a sentence which describes somehow the goal. The goal needs a better and more explicit definition. 2) In 2.1. Experimental site – more explicit information about the site is needed. Please, write the geographical coordinates and the elevation of the site. You may put a map of the situation in the country. 3) In Material and methods – no explanation of the methods of phonological observations, yield and yield attributes establishments, chemical analyses and economic indices 4) In Material and methods – no explanations on the statistical analysis used 5) In Table 2, column Yield (q/ha) - the measurement probably is not correct 6) No similar results from foreign literature are cited. 7) <u>No CONCLUSIONS at the end of the text.</u>	Respected sir Thanks to your valuable comments and critically review of MS, I have been corrected and incorporated all suggestion as per my best with yellow marks, if there is any more correction I will do. Corrections in MS as follows: 1) Aim of the study have been added 2) Experimental site more explicit with geographical information and w map also 3) All possible information add regarding to observations 2.5 4) statistical deign as per 2.8 5) corrected table correction and yield data as per statistical deign or yield observed from trail 6) Foreign literature are cited 7) Add valid conclusion
Minor REVISION comments	1) In Table 1 – must be Plant stand m⁻² instead of Plant stand/m⁻² (no back slash needed or no minus together with back slash) 2) In Table 2, column Net return and rows 103 and 104 – use the code INR for the Indian Rupee than the Indian	1) corrected in Table 1 2) Corrected INR for the Indian Rupee than the Indian Rupee sign



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Rupee sign 3) In Table 2, column B:C ratio – no clear specification under the table what B:C ratio means	3) Benefit : cost ratio specification has been corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1) Fig. 1 – Better illustrate the data by bars cause there is no connection between the data 2) In Part 2. Materials and Methods – some description of the biological properties of the crop will improve the text	1) Minor difference in protein content, so suitable fig. as it is with CD also. 2) add crop varietal characteristics