

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_110783
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF MAIZE (Zea mays L.)- SOYABEAN (Glycine max (L.) Merrill) INTERCROPPING PATTERNS ON GROWTH AND YIELD PARAMETERS OF SOYABEAN (Glycine max (L.) Merrill) IN KAIMOSI, VIHIGA COUNTY KENYA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article is well-written and informative. The article is suitable for the publication for "Asian Journal of Research in Botany" journal.</p> <p>However, the following key points can be taken care.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concept and methodology of the experiment are good 2. The experiment was carried out properly and work & methods were well reflected in the manuscript. 3. Title of article is opt and suitable 4. The abstract is comprehensive and well written. But the length is more than 300 words, which can be concise and brief if possible. 5. Introduction part is good and informative about the soya bean & maize production details, inter cropping system, yield and quality traits. Introduction is well described with pictures and maps 6. Material & methods part is descriptive about experimental material & conditions as well. 7. Results part is well written with very compatible and relevant discussions and reasonably based on experimental data and relevant literature. The results section is well supported with statistical anysis. -sudden change in font style in sub section paragraph of "Pod length of soybean" 8. Discussion and Conclusions are convening. 9. References section: References are relevant, recent and sufficient. -Some of the references were missing the article as mentioned bellow. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Missing references</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Introduction</th> <th colspan="2">Discussion</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mugendi, <i>et al.</i>, 2010</td> <td>Mutusso <i>et al.</i> (2014)</td> <td>Verreyne <i>et al.</i>, 2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jaetzold <i>et al.</i>, 2006</td> <td>Cai <i>et al.</i>, (2010),</td> <td>Ali <i>et al.</i>, 2012</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Baghdadi, (2015)</td> <td>(Gao <i>et al.</i>, 2010),</td> <td>Begna <i>et al.</i>, (2020)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Missing references			Introduction	Discussion		Mugendi, <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Mutusso <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Verreyne <i>et al.</i> , 2021	Jaetzold <i>et al.</i> , 2006	Cai <i>et al.</i> , (2010),	Ali <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Baghdadi, (2015)	(Gao <i>et al.</i> , 2010),	Begna <i>et al.</i> , (2020)	
Missing references																	
Introduction	Discussion																
Mugendi, <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Mutusso <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Verreyne <i>et al.</i> , 2021															
Jaetzold <i>et al.</i> , 2006	Cai <i>et al.</i> , (2010),	Ali <i>et al.</i> , 2012															
Baghdadi, (2015)	(Gao <i>et al.</i> , 2010),	Begna <i>et al.</i> , (2020)															
<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>	Overall, this is a valuable contribution in the area of intercropping of soybean and maize. The experiment is significant in field of Agronomy and plant physiology. To improve the manuscript, consider addressing the aforementioned points. The comments/ remarks only aim to provide constructive feedback to enhance the quality and impact of the research article.																

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:	B. Santhosh
Department, University & Country	Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, India