

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_125685
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of spatial arrangement on growth rate of okra in maize/okra intercrop in Kilifi, Kenya
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>

Review Form 3

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.	Intercropping results in optimization of land use, resource management, improvement of soil health, pest management such as weed and insects, and reduction of risk due to crop failure. Therefore, intercropping okra with maize is a good option as both crops respond differently to environmental factors. Okra offers early returns due to its shorter growing cycle, while maize provides additional revenue, making the combination a profitable and sustainable choice for farmers	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Quite appropriate	
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.	Although the abstract is comprehensive, it should be concise, avoiding any unnecessary statements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The Introduction section is too lengthy and should be concise, focusing on the crop's importance, major cultivation challenges, research gaps, and the specific problems addressed in the study, along with the objective. Avoid including irrelevant details, such as crop species or varieties.	
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.	In Section 2.5 (Data Collection and Analysis), the two subsections can be merged for clarity. If the results and discussion are to be presented separately, Section 3 (Results and Discussion) should be divided into two distinct sections: 3. Results and 4. Discussion. Overall, the manuscript is well-written.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references appears to be excessive and can be reduced by removing irrelevant ones. Additionally, Reference No. 34 is missing from the text and should be addressed.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quite good	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript may be considered for publication with revision.	

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:	Bhupender Singh
Department, University & Country	CCS Haryana Agricultural University, India