

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_126595
Title of the Manuscript:	ECONOMIC ANALYSIS, YIELD OPTIMIZATION, AND COMPETITION DYNAMICS OF GROUNDNUT/CEREAL FODDER INTERCROPPING SYSTEMS IN PAKISTAN'S SEMI-ARID TROPICS
Type of the Article	Research article

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the optimization of intercropping systems, particularly in terms of yield performance, nitrogen contribution, and economic returns. The study's use of randomized complete block design and detailed analysis of growth characteristics under varying treatments adds robustness to its findings. I appreciate the manuscript for its practical implications in sustainable agriculture, offering clear evidence on the benefits of maize-groundnut intercropping. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed exploration of the underlying mechanisms driving the observed results.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, its well suited.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is quite comprehensive, covering key aspects such as yield performance, nitrogen contribution, and economic considerations of intercropping. However, here are a few suggestions for improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify Statistical Significance: Mention whether the reduction in productivity for intercropping was statistically significant. 2. Highlight Key Findings: Emphasize the most important results, such as the highest LER for maize and the MAI for maize-groundnut intercrop. 3. Include Practical Implications: Briefly state the practical implications of the findings for farmers and sustainable agriculture practices. 4. Conciseness: Ensure the abstract remains concise while including these additional points to maintain readability. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, they are in line.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous experimental design and comprehensive data analysis. The use of a randomized complete block design ensures that the results are statistically valid and reliable. Additionally, the detailed examination of growth characteristics, nodulation, and nitrogen content across different cropping systems provides a thorough understanding of the intercropping effects. The inclusion of economic indices like the Monetary Advantage Index (MAI) further strengthens the manuscript by linking agronomic performance with economic viability, making the findings highly relevant and applicable.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>There are some problems with the references. Author needs to recheck it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Mahabub Alam
Department, University & Country	Uttar Banga Krishi Viswavidyalaya, India