

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_127227
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of pigeonpea (Cajanus cajan) based intercropping system under varying planting patterns
Type of the 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 (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.	Pigeonpea-based intercropping systems can promote sustainable agriculture, resource optimization, crop yield improvement, pest and disease management, soil health and fertility, climate resilience, and economic viability. By understanding how pigeonpea performs in these systems, researchers can inform sustainable cropping strategies, optimize land, water, and nutrient use, and enhance biodiversity. This knowledge can lead to more efficient agricultural practices, reducing inputs and maximizing outputs. Additionally, understanding the economic aspects of intercropping can help farmers make informed decisions, enhance profitability, and maintain ecological balance. The findings can also guide future research in agroecology and sustainable agriculture, ultimately leading to more resilient agricultural systems. Therefore, I like it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is.	
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 is poorly written and lacks depth in key elements such as background/introduction, objectives, results, and conclusions and future directions. It does not clearly state the context, aims, significant data, and implications of the research. Additionally, it does not include literature references, which is not common practice. The abstract cites Willey et al., 1980, and it would be more effective to present background information in a more general manner.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is not appropriate, particularly in materials and methods lacks subsections and structure	
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	The introduction of an agronomy manuscript should provide a clear rationale for the research, outlining its context and significance. Key elements include background information, problem statement, primary aims, significance, scope, limitations, and manuscript structure. However, the introduction lacks these elements, making it poorly written and unclear.	

Review Form 3

<p>sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The results and discussion section should include data presentation, statistical analysis, key findings, and comparison with previous research. The discussion should discuss implications, explanations, limitations, practical applications, policy-making, and future research directions. The summary should present key findings, summarize statistical analyses, highlight significant results, and provide concise language to describe the data. Major revision is needed to address these issues.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>In this manuscript, the literature and previous related works are limited. In the introduction section, only two works are cited, and throughout the entire manuscript, a total of only twelve works are referenced, which is quite few. Therefore, more relevant works should be added, and the manuscript should be rewritten; otherwise, it may not be accepted for publication.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It is not suitable. The overall writing quality of this manuscript is poor and requires significant grammatical improvement.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yirsaw Hunegnaw Asres</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Debre Markos University, Ethiopia</p>