

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104062
Title of the Manuscript:	Pigeon pea-based intercropping system: A review
Type of the Article	Review 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>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The work is important because it compiles information that allows giving a general idea of the intercropping system, what happens in such a system and in some way complements the literature on the theme.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable, but I suggest: Intercropping system based on pigeon pea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i>): a review.</p> <p>3. The abstract is acceptable.</p> <p>4. The work has a logical structure.</p> <p>5. To be scientifically correct it is necessary to make in the file all the corrections suggested in the comment boxes.</p> <p>6. The work has 118 bibliographic references and only 21 are within the interval 2020-2023. The number of recent references should be increased because the purpose of a "review" type work is to update the scientific community on recent advances.</p> <p>In relation to the works cited, information can be found: - That was not documented or does not appear in the consulted work. - Not well supported. - Supported by the errors of others for not consulting the initial source. - Documented but with the addition of undocumented terms. - That does not reconcile, is not consistent, does not correspond, or is not related to cited works.</p> <p>There is uncited text. There are details in the tables. There are considerable errors in the elaboration of bibliographic references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I include in comment boxes corrections of the bibliographic references. Blue color in the text suggests addition. Red color in the text are comments that should be deleted later. In some parts there are words and letters struck-through.</p>	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Carlos Alberto Padrón Pereira
Department, University & Country	RVCTA, Venezuela