

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99070
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF INTERCROPPING SONCHUS OLERACEOUS WITH MAIZE AND COWPEA ON BIOMASS AND SOIL CONSERVATION
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:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community as it shows that intercropping maize with sonchus is not only feasible but it also improved ground cover and biomass yields. 2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive as it is summarising the aim of the study, the methodology, the study design and giving some key results 4. Yes, subsections and manuscript structure are appropriate 5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically consistent 6. The references are sufficient and relatively recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Yes, the language of the article is suitable for scholarly communication. But authors should pay attention to some minor mistakes. 2. There are at least 3 references cited by authors but not listed in the "references section". On the other hand, there is 1 reference listed in the "references section" that is not cited by authors in the text.	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amine Slim
Department, University & Country	Tunisia