



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 <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	The manuscript presented an in-depth study concerning the evaluation of the biological efficiency and economic advantages of intercropping and integrated soil fertility management in maize and soybean crops. The research should contribute new information to the field of intercropping systems. In particular, what makes this study interesting is the objective to experimentally assess the effects of integrated soil practices management on crop competition, yields components and economics advantage in maize-soybean intercropping system. However, the manuscript at the present form is not ready for publication. The main problem with the manuscript is Experimental design and trial implementation section. Significant improvement will have to be	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	made by addressing some key issues identified below: - In page 4, line 16 of this section, the authors reported that “The study was undertaken during the long rain season in 2010-2011”. It is not reported if the experiment was repeated in time; The results could not be conclusive with only one growing season. - In page 4, line 16-26 of this section, the authors reported that “In each site, three trials were conducted. The first trial consisted of maize alone, the second with soybean alone and the third was an association of maize and soybean. The experiment design for each trial was randomized complete block with six treatments and four replications. Each plot measured 3 x 4 meters. The treatments included a control (traditional method) or Without Fertilizer (WF); Conventional method or Mineral Fertilizer (MF) at 115-63-0; Biological method consisting of the application of <i>Entada abyssinica</i> biomasses (EAB) alone at 8 t ha-122; <i>Tithonia diversifolia</i>	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	biomasses (TDB) alone at 8 t ha⁻¹ 23 and integrated soil fertility management (ISFM) method consisting of the application of MF at 57,5-31,5-0 combined with <i>E. abyssinica</i> at 4 t ha⁻¹ 24 ½ (MF+EAB) and MF at 57,5-31,5-0 combined with <i>T. diversifolia</i> at 4 t ha⁻¹ 25 ½ (MF+TDB). The experiment design for each site may be or should be: split plot where the following three trials, i.e. maize alone, soybean alone, association of maize and soybean constitute the main plots, while the six treatments constitute the subplots: {1. Without Fertilizer (WF); 2. Conventional method or Mineral Fertilizer (MF) at 115-63-0; 3. Biological method consisting of the application of <i>Entada abyssinica</i> biomasses (EAB) alone at 8 t ha⁻¹ 122; 4. <i>Tithonia diversifolia</i> biomasses (TDB) alone at 8 t ha⁻¹; 5. Integrated soil fertility management (ISFM) method consisting of the application of MF at 57,5-31,5-0 combined with <i>E. abyssinica</i> at 4 t ha⁻¹ 24 ½ (MF+EAB) and 6. MF at 57,5-31,5-0 combined	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	with <i>T. diversifolia</i> at 4 t ha⁻¹ 25 ½ (MF +TDB)}. If the experiment design for each site was split plot, the analysis of variance (ANOVA), would change the tables and the results and discussion sections. If the experiment design in two sites was randomized complete block with six treatments separately for each trial (3 experiments), it would be like comparing results (yield components, yield components, competition indices and economic intercropping advantage parameters) from different experiments. - In addition, in page 4, line 16-18 the authors reported that "In each site, three trials were conducted. The first trial consisted of maize alone, the second with soybean alone and the third was an association of maize and soybean". It is not reported in which proportion there was an association of maize and soybean and why only one proportion ??. In page 4, line 10-12 the authors reported that "Typically, Gandajika soils consist of a	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	collection of sandy on clay sediment more often based on a shallow lateritic old slab. The adsorption complex is fairly well saturated and there are still some weatherable minerals (Muyayabantu et al., 2012a)". The soil physicochemical characteristics and the initial nitrate content are not presented before established of experiments. The authors should be reported that experiments were established on a soil whose physicochemical characteristics were sand g kg⁻¹, silt ... g kg⁻¹, clay g kg⁻¹, organic C content g kg⁻¹ and pH (1:2 H₂O) Preplant soil analysis conducted in the (time)..... showed that initial nitrate content ranged from-to mg kg⁻¹ of soil. The title 'Assessing biological efficiency and economic advantages of intercropping and integrated soil fertility management in maize (<i>Zea mays L.</i>) and soybean (<i>Glycine max L.</i>) crops in a Sub-Saharan Africa Region' it should be changed	
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	because it does not correspond in the content of this work. Overall, I recommend a "major revision".	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kico Dhima
Department, University & Country	Department of Plant Production, Technological & Educational Institute of Thessaloniki, Greece