



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJPSS_11150
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of intercropping on nitrogen fixation of three groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogaea</i> L) genotypes in the guinea savanna zone of Ghana.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Things I would appreciate to see in the paper: (i) Botanical types in a table (ii) Tabular presentation of the growth characteristics of both Obatanpa and the 3 groundnut genotypes before the intercrop (iii) Maturity regimes of these groundnut genotypes (iv) Time of planting: were all the crops planted on the same day? (v) Was Soil tests done before? If yes then what are the differences now (vi) Maize and groundnuts seed sources (Were they first grade Foundation for groundnuts and fresh OPV seeds for Obatanpa or the one after many Cycles of savings). Remember, age/cycle of the crops affects performance (vii) When does the maize variety peak vegetatively? For instance, when the groundnuts had 50% and 75% anthesis, what was the stage of maize? Were they at the same stages too?	

Formatted Table



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Mere mentioning (pages 108 and 109)that the climate, vegetation and soil characteristics of the experimental site are described in earlier report do not help the readers of this paper. Please give a brief findings of Konlan et al., 2013a Results For clarity and ease of following, the table of results should be brought to this section as they are discussed Conclusion part Generally, lower plant densities led to bigger plants with wider canopies which then translated into higher dry matter production per plant in both years (pages 371 and 372). So wider spacing in this experimental arrangement could have translated into higher pod and dry matter yield Increasing groundnut population density therefore led to slight reductions in canopy size (pages 360 and 361). What is the optimum plant density then in this experimental design? I need to see this clearly in the conclusion Groundnut responds well to residual nitrogen not direct application. What was the previous crop(s) in that field? Was there any fertilization before this experiment? You need to capture this in the methodologies. I wish there were staggering of planting dates in this study e.g planting maize later post emergence of groundnuts. After full establishment, maize root systems are aggressive and grow extensively since post anthesis there will be no more roots growth and the developing/growing cob will solely depend on the anchoring already established earlier. So the groundnuts next to the maize plants could have been affected much. I wish there were differential recordings	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	of data on the groundnut near and far away from the maize plants in the intercrop instead of the average presented	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Was there any staggering of the planting dates e.g 2-4 weeks after groundnuts	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Well written paper	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kalule Okello David
Department, University & Country	National Groundnuts improvement Programme , Uganda