

Thank you for pointing out the various errors on the paper. However, I am not convinced that tables 2 and 3 are the same or that the data was repeated. Table 2 present the data on the performance of cowpea variety and spatial arrangement on yearly basis. From Table 2, you cannot tell whether the performance of cowpea in 2009 was better than 2010 statistically whereas table 3 presented that fact. In order words, table had two factors whereas table 3 was a combined analysis of the 2 years. (i.e. three factors were involved in running the analysis or what can be refers to pooled means of the two year data). The grain yields of the two varieties of cowpea in table 3 were significantly different from each other with certainty unlike table 2.

The figures 1-4 were graphical illustration of the differential responses whereas the table simply told us that the interactions were significant and could not be visually imagined how the responses were. Conclusively, I will reluctantly allow you to remove the figures, but I insist that table 3 should remain as it is.

The conclusion is consistent with table 5. The productivity of intercrop is measured by LER and not the individual performance of the component crops in tables 2, 3 and 4.

Looking forward to hearing from you.