

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128965
Title of the Manuscript:	To evaluate the relative efficacy of Alley Species with respect to hedge- row persistence, herbage yield and fuel wood production.
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study compares the performance of Leucaena and Sesbania in an agroforestry system over two kharif seasons, focusing on herbage yield, fuelwood production, and soil fertility. Leucaena proved superior for fodder production, yielding 119.59 q/ha, while Sesbania excelled in fuelwood production at 42.55 q/ha. Pruning management enhanced soil fertility and organic carbon content, with specific regimes favoring growth and nutrient uptake. These findings offer sustainable solutions for addressing fodder shortages, fuelwood needs, and soil health, contributing to improved agroforestry practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	We would suggest: "Evaluating the Efficacy of Alley Cropping Species for Herbage Yield, Fuelwood Production, and Hedge-Row Persistence"	
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 of the article is quite comprehensive. No addition or deletion needed.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically, correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	The article meets modern requirements for scientific work and can be published. No plagiarism is suspected. There are no competing interest issues in the manuscript. There are no ethical issues in the manuscript.	

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:	Alexandru Mirza
Department, University & Country	Moldova State University, Republic of Moldova