



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

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 (Zea mays L.) and soybean (Glycine max L.) crops in a Sub-Saharan Africa Region.

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
I cannot accept that the authors conducted 3 trials as they claim. If so, the data for each experiment should be analyzed separately. Which means that the data of the 3 trials cannot be compared as the author did in this paper. I strongly feel that the data should be reanalyzed using appropriate experimental design. Also, since grain yields of both crops were the main data used for all the intercropping indices, the strongest ones should be presented since almost all of them arrived at the same conclusion.	The reviewer made useful additional suggestions that were considered and addressed. In response to his insistence to conduct separate analyses, we feel that this is not required based on the objectives to compare biological treatments under different settings. For economic data where we need to determine the effects of sole maize, soybean and intercrop, we did separate these components in the analyses (see Tables 7 and 8), There are different ways of running and analysing experiments based on hypotheses and study goals. Although the reviewer may have a case if one need to determine the main and secondary effects and interactions, this was not the purpose of our study. In fact by combining this will give you a better and more accurate assessment of your treatments under different conditions for biological data. We did adjust the statement in the text to reflect our goal. Instead of three trials were conducted, we changed to a trial with 3 components was conducted. We have attached the revised 2 version.