



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_53118
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of tillage and weed control techniques on Energy dynamics and profitability of chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) -rice cropping sequence in irrigated ecosystem of C.G. Plains
Type of the 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	<p>This article is scientifically robust and technically sound. However, few corrections could still be effected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 32: Sharma, 2009 is not cited under the end/back References. 2. Lines 138 to 140 - Kachhadiya et al. 2009 ; Lines 153 to 154 – Singh R. C. 1985 ; Lines 162 to 163 – Upadhyay and Bhalla 2002 ; were not used/cited within the body text. 3. Plates No.1 to 3 could all be shifted before the back / end References, they are good evidence and are part of the write-up , I suggest could be put even before the Conclusion. 4. The whole write-up including all the References could be put in the accepted format for this Journal (CJAST). 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Corrections could be made as hereby suggested –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 1: control techniques on ; Line 8: techniques ; Lines 9 to 11: sequence under an irrigated ecosystem of c.g. plains. The plots were divided into main and sub plots, tillage and weed management practices were adopted . Three Line 16: weedy check (W_3), in sub plots were used. Line 19: (T_3) were employed among the ; Line 20: efficiency was 5.46 q -- ; Line 26: net return was Rs.19086.74 ha⁻¹ and B:C ratio was 1.04. ; Line 29: crop grown under an area ; Line 30: 7.7 million tons, ; Line 36: and a change in ; Line 38: required for tillage is ; Line 43: keeping the above in ; Line 44: tillage systems and to evaluate the more ; 2. Line 47: Keywords: Rice – chickpea cropping, Tillage and weed management, Energy use efficiency, Energy productivity Line 49: A field experiment was undertaken to study the combined ; Line 51: rice. The soil of the experimental : Line 59: spacing of ; Line 60: irrigation was done at the time of ; Line 61: for the establishment of optimum plant stands. <p>Could transfer Lines 65 to 69 to Line 62 (could be put under Methodology) as follows – Line 62: Energy inputs were calculated and estimated in Mega Joule (MJ) ha⁻¹ with reference to the standard values prescribed by Singh <i>et al.</i> (1985). These inputs were applied to each treatment of chickpea crops. ----- summed up to obtain energy use efficiency and energy productivity. Could also explain in brief B:C ratio and how it was calculated.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Line 63: Results and Discussion 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>(a) Energetics- Three tillage and nine weed management practices evaluated during the 2 year periods are presented below:- Line 70: As presented in Table 1, the highest energy use ----- ; Line 71: zero tillage, followed by minimum and conventional tillage systems (Table 1). End of Line 72: required for ; Line 74: practices, highest energy ; Line 75: found with the application ; Line 77: in weedy check (W_9) (see Table 1). This might be ; Line 79: herbicides were better in terms of ; Line 81: Predesh were 2336 ;</p> <p>Line 85 to 86: un-weeded check was 22416 MJ ha⁻¹.</p> <p>Line 87:</p> <p>(b) Economics- Data collected indicated that among the tillage management practices, highest gross ; (Please always note that maximum is different from highest in English language, ie. You can say minimum tillage, but with figures you say highest or lowest.) Line 93: conventional tillage required the highest ; Line 94: to minimum tillage (₹ 16790.70 ha⁻¹) ; Line 97: As shown in Table 1, highest net return to minimum (₹ 16790.70 ha⁻¹) Below Line 108: within Table 1: Energy use efficiency (q MJ⁻¹ x10⁻³ ha⁻¹) ; Line 109: Could put footnote - B:C = ??? ;</p> <p>4. Line 111: Conclusion Line 112: This study revealed that among the various tillage practices, highest energy use ; Line 115: control methods, highest energy use efficiency, 5.46 q (please could note that If you are not putting 'of' before or after the figures you could put ',') ; Lines 118 to 119: The economic production of this experiment in terms of net return was highest under (T_1) conventional tillage (19824.21 Rs. ha⁻¹) with B:C ratio 1.19 and (W_8) at one hand ; Lines 121 to 122: with net return Rs.19086.74 ha⁻¹ and B:C ratio of 1.04. The lowest net return ; Line 163: (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.).</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Good work, could read through and do correction as much as possible.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Grace O. Tona
Department, University & Country	Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria