



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2628
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing biological efficiency and economic advantages of intercropping and integrated soil fertility management in maize (<i>Zea mays</i> L.) and soybean (<i>Glycine max</i> L.) crops in a Sub-Saharan Africa Region.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

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

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The title should be modified as suggested in the body of the MS. The abstract should be beefed up to include some quantitative data and highlight the major findings of the study. Physical and chemical properties of soils of the 2 sites of the study should be provided. The methods for obtaining the yields of the crops on the field should be detailed. How the prices (costs) of the inputs (mineral fertilizers, plant residues, labour etc.) were obtained/estimated should be highlighted. I suggest that the data be reanalyzed to show effects of main and sub treatments and interactions (if any) on the parameters estimated. This may affect the way the results and tables are presented.	The Reviewer overall made very useful comments in the hard copy that were addressed when possible. We thank him for the time he spent on the manuscript. The manuscript is certainly better because of several of his comments . ----- The title has been modified and the abstract has been adjusted. Soil analysis has been published in Chemistry and Ecology journal and we have added that reference. The price (costs) of inputs were estimated based local prices of materials and wages. We feel that the statistical analyses that we performed were consistent with our objectives and expected results. More importantly the analyses were based on our experimental design (complete randomized design and not a split plot design in which the main effects and sub treatments have to be determined.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Since most of the indices of biological and economic efficiencies resulted in similar conclusions, then some of them could be dropped to avoid an over kill and shorten the length of the MS thereby making it more interesting to follow	Where necessary, we addressed all the comments made by the reviewers on the hard copy. Although some indices might have led to similar conclusions, we feel that we have to keep them to show that our conclusion is backed by multiple analyses.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The MS require some language editing	A throughout editing of the manuscript was completed.