

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124637
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of intercropping systems on the management of defoliators in Groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L.)
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.	In the context of increasing ecological threats from using chemical pesticides to control crop pests, this study examines the potential eco-friendly alternative method i.e., intercropping to manage the defoliator pests of groundnut. The results of this study are having the practical field application, which can be easily adapted by farmers. However, more extensive investigations are required to test the feasibility and efficiency of the intercropping methods mentioned in this study.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes. It is comprehensive. However few corrections are suggested which can be addressed in the revised manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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>While the study is having more practical applications and results are promising, there is a need of major revision in terms of presenting the results in the research paper. There are lot of lacunas with respect to scientific robustness and technical correctness of this paper which can be corrected in the revised version</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Introduction part should include information on the intercropping system, its advantages, with recent references. 2. The results can be presented in a more appropriate manner. The table numbers should be mentioned in the text of results. 3. The text in the results should paper in the same order as the appearances of tables, either change the text or tables order. 4. Provide the tables in presentable form. Must mention the foot notes for all the tables as suggested in the manuscript. 5. In the Materials and methods, it is mentioned that data on natural enemies was recorded. But in the results, there is no mention of this 6. Results should be supported by more references 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	NO. need of many more references. The references already mentioned are too old. Further, many references cited under 'References' section are not present in text of the manuscript. It indicates the ignorance of authors in writing of this paper.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Satisfactory	
Optional/General comments	By addressing all the suggested corrections, this paper can be published	

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:	Mahendra K R
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, India