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** *(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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The manuscript is impressive in its social, economic, and environmental aspects, especially given the current worsening climate change scenario. Balancing the use of synthetic fertilizers with green manure promotes healthier soils and a better environment for sustainable agriculture. This practice also enhances the intensification of planting these species, which contributes to biodiversity conservation and environmental benefits.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes. But I made a minor edition as 'Evaluation of the relative efficacy of Alley Species with respect to hedge- row persistence, herbage yield and fuel wood production, District name, South/East/West/North Country name'**	
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** • **Addition of introductory sentence, and why the study is important.** • **Recommendation of the place in the abstract** • **Italizing the spp. Name** • **Standardizing abstract**	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	**Yes. But still, standardization remains like standardizing the conclusion and recommendation part**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	**No. Most of the references used in the manuscript are outdated and lack in discussion part**	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	**Yes. But it still needs more editions**	
Optional/General comments	**The big problem with the manuscript is the standard edition problem. For example, the species name should be written fully when it appears in the first sentence, like *Leucaena leucocephalla* and *Sesbania sesban* taken from the manuscript. Then, in the next sentences, it must be written as *L. leucocephalla* and *S. sesban.*** **PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT**	

Commented [Ma1]: Check spelling

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Bonsa Fentale Jilo**
Department, University & Country	**Adami Tulu Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia**