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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | **The topic and scope addressed by the article are relevant, considering the economic and social importance of pigeon pea cultivation, notably with reference to food security and the sustainable use of renewable natural resources. The provision of appropriate practices for the irrigation of pigeon pea is very important, since water is currently a finite natural resource and of high environmental sensitivity. Furthermore, the evaluation of management practices that enable the achievement of higher grain yields from pigeon pea is relevant to ensure food with high nutritional value, whether for human or animal consumption.** | Considering the reviewer's remarks, it is ensured that the introduction and discussion sections of the revised manuscript more clearly highlight the significance of pigeon pea in the context of food security and resource sustainability. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is appropriate and consistent with the scope and objectives of the article.** | The changes suggested are done in the title of revised manuscript. |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | **The article's abstract is adequate and faithfully expresses all the topics of the article, from introduction, methodology, treatments, results, and conclusions. The abstract's formatting satisfactorily addresses all the activities carried out during the experiment.** | The changes suggested are done in the abstract section of revised manuscript. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **Yes. The authors used the scientific method satisfactorily. The methodology is consistent with the scope and objectives of the article. The parameters evaluated and the response variables are adequate. The experimental design adopted was compatible with the treatments evaluated.** | The changes suggested and details to be added in the section are done in the methodology section of revised manuscript. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | **The bibliographical references are compatible with the scope of the article, in quantitative and qualitative terms, satisfactorily meeting the theoretical framework on the subject addressed. However, the authors did not include the references used in the text of the article. We strongly suggest that each section of the article that is supported by a bibliographical reference be explicitly detailed. The use of references that are not cited in the text of the article is not justifiable.** | The references suggested to add are added in the section and are also mentioned in the respective section for reference. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **The article is written clearly and is easy to understand by different audiences. The article's topics are chronologically appropriate. The sentence construction is concise and satisfactorily reflects the facts narrated in the different phases of the experiment.** | The changes suggested as per grammatical and sentence construction concern by reviewer are done in the revised manuscript. |
| Optional/General comments | **The article presents several methodological gaps, which should be overcome in order to increase the reliability of the experimental data and improve the quality of the manuscript.**  **1. Explain the type of soil (soil class). 2. Present the chemical characteristics of the soil. 3. Was any fertilization performed? If so, what were the doses, types of fertilizers and application times. 4. Definition of the experimental treatments. 5. What is the experimental design and number of repetitions? 6. What statistical analyses are used to evaluate the results? 7. In Table 1, what are the units of measurement for the production of pigeon pea grains? 8. Literally, the authors did not discuss the data obtained. It is suggested that the discussion of the experimental data be carried out, supported by the literature cited in the Bibliographic References section. 9. Which pigeon pea cultivar was used? 10. Accumulated rainfall during the experimental period.**  **The conclusions are adequate and faithfully express the facts recorded during the experiment.** | The possible suggested changes among the comments are done in the revised manuscript. |
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|  | **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?** | *(If yes, kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | No ethical issues. The suggested changes and details regarding the experiment are provided in the revised manuscript. |