

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_126883
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND ROW RATIO ON THE PERFORMANCE OF CHICKPEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) + LINSEED (<i>Linum usitatissimum</i> L.) INTERCROPPING
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 research work was done by the authors contributed a good potential work in the intercropping systems discipline	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY OF CROPPING SYSTEM AND ROW RATIO ON THE PERFORMANCE OF CHICKPEA (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) + LINSEED (<i>Linum usitatissimum</i> L.) INTERCROPPING SYSTEM	
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.	Mention the treatments which was on par with highest treatment and also mention which was performed better with organic module and write a line about summary of the experiment	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	If possible, mention cropping systems and cropping modules under the seed yield, stover yield and so on	
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.	The article is well written and this research work helps in future studies as they can study in detail about the treatment	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	There are so many recent research articles are available. In the discussion part, recent references can be added for sound discussion 1. Torkaman M, Mirshekari B, Farahvash F, Yarnia M and Jafari AA 2018. Effect of sowing date and different intercropping patterns on yield and yield components of rapeseed (<i>Brassica napus</i> L.) and chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.). <i>Legume Res</i> 41: 578-83 2. M V Priya, K S Saini, Thakar Singh and Sompal Singh. 2023. Growth parameters and competitive indices of bed planted chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) as influenced by different intercropping systems. <i>Agric Res J</i> 60 (2) : 190-195.	

Review Form 3

	<p>3. Priya M V, Singh T, Saini K S and Singh S 2022. Production potential and economic returns of bed planted chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</i> L.) as influenced by different intercropping systems. <i>Legume Res</i> 45: 347-351</p> <p>4. Shubha G V, Biradar S A, Satyanaraynrao, Koppalkar BG, Govindappa M R, Ajithkumar K and Rajanna 2015. Performance of sorghum and linseed intercropping system with different row proportion and planting geometry under rainfed condition. <i>J Oilseeds Res</i> 32: 97-99</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Check the spells of the highlighted words in the document2. Mention the new references as given in the above table3. Mention the reason why the yields were low and high4. Change the conclusion statement, whether you are supporting inorganic module or natural module. If you are not supporting any module, write the statements as mentioned in the 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M V Priya
Department, University & Country	Acharya N G Ranga Agricultural University, India