

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_124017</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Doubling the farmer's Income through marigold as intercrop in drumstick</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This kind of manuscript is essential in the production system in agriculture. Intercropping is one way to increase yield without additional needed area. I like this manuscript because of its importance in improving agriculture productivity.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>I think it would be better to put the scientific names of the crops being studied.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>I suggest for better improvement of the abstract section It would be better to emphasize the objectives of the study and also avoid writing like "we".</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Okay.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript needs more improvement on the introduction aligned with the objectives, materials, and methods 9 detailed discussion on every procedures) in-depth discussion based on the findings, and conclusion.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>	<p>Add more references.</p>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Improved the English quality.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bryan S. Palcon</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Caraga State University, Philippines</b>