

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_120926
Title of the Manuscript:	Nutrient Management in Maize+Cowpea Intercropping System : A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is interesting. As a Review article, it addresses an interesting topic from agronomic, ecological and economic perspectives.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article is suitable	
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 Abstract of the article is adequate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The article is well structured, in relation to the objectives evaluated by the authors, considering that it is a Review article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It would have been appropriate if the authors of the study had presented more information in the form of data based on the bibliographic sources studied, regarding the nutrient regimen or other advantages associated with intercropping (yields, profitability, environment, etc.)	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The bibliographic sources are representative, and in accordance with the subject of the study.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<p>"maize + cowpea" and "maize+cowpea" In some places it is written with a space, and in other places it is written without a space (for example, in the summary, but also in the content of the article). It is recommended to revise, to be written in a unified manner throughout the article.</p> <p>It is advisable to present the name of the plants and the Latin version (in parentheses), for a better understanding on the part of the readers. e.g. page 2, "jowar", "bajra"</p>	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Florin Sala
Department, University & Country	University of Life Sciences "King Mihai I" from Timisoara, Romania