Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_130457**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Effect of Intercropping on Growth and Yield of (*Hibiscus sabdariffa* L.), Mesta (Roselle) in India**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The research titled " **Effect of Intercropping on Growth and Yield of (Hibiscus sabdariffa L.), Mesta (Roselle) in India** " is well articulated and addresses a fundamental topic within the field of mesta intercropping systems. The study identifies height and fibre yield as some critical attributes which were measured in the research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, this title is suitable. However, I have recommended some amendments in terms of including the botanical name of the crop. Also, there is a need to insert the country of study as indicated in the provided track changes and comments	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The introduction section is good and shows the significance of the study. There is need to tell the audience about the treatments and the design of the study. I have also noted that the conclusion, recommendations, and suggestions for future scientific research sections are missing in the abstract. Therefore, this should also be addressed to make it more robust and informative.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	In my opinion, Yes. However, some sections could be written better as highlighted on the track changes and correcting a few typos. We need to see discussion section very clearly on the results and discussion section. Therefore, the study is worthy to be published.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient, all of them are most recent-2006 to 2022. The cited and referenced materials are relevant to the present article with all citations in the reference list. However some texts require in text citation as highlighted and references to be arranged better.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Please check a few grammar and punctuation typo errors in the article. Some of the errors are indicated in the track changes and comments. Please address them to improve on this article.	
Optional/General comments	The paper has a few typographical and grammatical mistakes which needs to be addressed to make the article better. Overall, I believe the article is acceptable after addressing a few suggested revisions.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Bernard Muthengi Yumbya**
Department, University & Country	**Kenya**