



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_31643
Title of the Manuscript:	SORGHUM /LEGUME INTERCROP ON STEM BORER DAMAGE AND YIELD OF SORGHUM.
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 (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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract should include small part of introduction, objective, materials and method, design used, data collected and results. 2. The methodology does not explain the intercropping method. 3. It says the trial was done for three seasons??? how is the result analyzed (Combined .. ??) 4. The results are good but the write up is poor, the author needs to consult senior entomologist or others and he should review more papers on write up of intercropping 5. The discussion part is also ok but it needs more work on write up. 6. Result focus only on those data that gave good result, but it needs to write column by column assessment and write 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Agreed and have done some corrections 2). Experimental procedure and treatments section does explain this 3). Agreed and have corrected under experimental procedure 4) Have consulted senior Entomologist in the Department and this work was presented at the Annual ZAS review of Research Results 6). Our senior researchers indicated that it is better to generate meaning from where results were significant rather than on where results are no
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All scientific names should be written in italicized 2. References are old need more review on new ones 3. Title of table should be written on the top of the table and the title of the figure should be at the bottom of the fig. Please ref. journals 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Agreed and have done some corrections 2) Agreed and have done corrections 3) Agreed and corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">4. The author should use either Duncns multiple rang or Lsd, P value one of them only.5. The figures are not clear, need re-visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">4) We use the p value for significance levels. Duncan is used for ranking5) Have revisited them
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is interesting but need more work in write up and reconstruction of the paper	There is need also to get into fertility and moisture retention management from this work.