



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJPSS_18340
Title of the Manuscript:	Soil Water Conservation Methods Affected Growth of Sorghum Intercropped with Cowpea in Different Locations of Western Sudan.
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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Intercropping legumes and non-legumes is a common agricultural practice in many parts of the world in order to increase the productivity per unit area of the land. In this aspect, this manuscript could contribute to our knowledge concerning the agricultures practices best fitted to the different types of intercropping practices. However, the manuscript in its current form is in a rather premature stage and needs to be rewritten from scratch.</p> <p>The language as well as the format of the manuscript needs extensive changes and improvements (ie Materials and Methods/Data collection, or the Results and Discussion section). Actually, I feel that even the title needs to be rewritten; I think that this work examines the impact of the various soil AND water conservation methods. Moreover, the manuscript has a number of shortcomings. For example, the authors don't explain the difference between the treatments S2 and C1, whilst they don't describe the Geria method. Moreover, numerical data presentation in tables and in such a sequential fashion is rather weak and confusing, whilst the authors need to explain the statistically significant differences observed between the two growing seasons. Even, the scientific name of the cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i>) is incorrectly written (pages 1 and 2).</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Styliani N. Chorianopoulou
Department, University & Country	Crop Science Department, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece