Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115506
Title of the Manuscript:	Response of spacing and row proportions to growth, yield and economics of turmeric and okra intercropping system under North Eastern Ghat Zone of Odisha
Type of the Article	

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)
Yes, it is important for the scientific community.	
NO. The title should be "Turmeric intercropping systems; effects and economics of spacing and rows in North Eastern Ghat Zone of Odisha in India	
No. Information of other inputs people to included	
No. There are very old references eg, Narayanpur and Sulikeri(1996); Singh and Randhawa (1988)	
some of the references are missing in the document; eg. Sivaraman and Palaniappan (1994), Kindly go through these references and make further corrections.	
There are no cost values. Only Benefit Cost ratio values is provided. Information on inputs and method of identifying the cost is not presented. Include cost values. These are missing in the data. Add data of the inputs used and the different combination use for each treatment. There are different factors that affect the yield. Include these factors to the study. The spacing is one of the many factors. Did the author use the same variety of planting material, seed and other inputs?	
It is fairly good.	
The idea is good, but there is need for further information to make it understandable. It looks abstract and difficult to comprehend. There are some grammatical errors which is largely due to the spacing.	
	Yes, it is important for the scientific community. NO. The title should be "Turmeric intercropping systems; effects and economics of spacing and rows in North Eastern Ghat Zone of Odisha in India No, Information of other inputs needs to included. There is limited information on the methodology in terms of the inputs used. No. There is no methodology for the economics section No. There are very old references eg, Narayanpur and Sulikeri (1996); Singh and Randhawa (1988) some of the references are missing in the document; eg. Sivaraman and Palaniappan (1994), Kindly go through these references and make further corrections. There are no cost values. Only Benefit Cost ratio values is provided. Information on inputs and method of identifying the cost is not presented. Include cost values. These are missing in the data. Add data of the inputs used and the different combination use for each treatment. There are different factors that affect the yield. Include these factors to the study. The spacing is one of the many factors. Did the author use the same variety of planting material, seed and other inputs? It is fairly good.

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

		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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yaa Oguabi Osei-Mensah
Department, University & Country	Institute of Statical Social and Economic Research, University of Ghana, Ghana

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 1.7 (15-12-2022)