

- **Title and abstract**
  - Does the title clearly reflect the content of the article?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
  - Does the abstract present the main findings of the study?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
- **Introduction**
  - Are the research questions/hypotheses/predictions clearly presented?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
  - Does the introduction build on relevant research in the field?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
- **Materials and methods**
  - Are the methods and analyses sufficiently detailed to allow replication by other researchers?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
  - Are the methods and statistical analyses appropriate and well described?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
- **Results**
  - In the case of negative results, is there a statistical power analysis (or an adequate Bayesian analysis or equivalence testing)?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
  - Are the results described and interpreted correctly?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
- **Discussion**
  - Have the authors appropriately emphasized the strengths and limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know
  - Are the conclusions adequately supported by the results (without overstating the implications of the findings)?  Yes,  No (please explain),  I don't know

Very interesting and necessary research, although the results are obvious to me. It is obvious to anyone with at least a minimal knowledge of biology, or more specifically ecology, that a system of food production that mimics nature must be more productive than species-poor systems or even monocultures. One of the many problems with the current dominant system of intensive agriculture (often called industrial agriculture) is that it measures the productivity of only one crop, the authors write. And the high productivity of nature-imitating agriculture is particularly evident in forest-mimicking methods (agroforestry), with all their biodiversity, and such are permacultures - of course not in the first few years after establishment, as the authors also point out. I myself would compare the process of permaculture formation to natural succession. In short, a 'mature' permaculture is not only producing food, but is an arrangement of mutually supporting species. There is an important social thread in the assumptions of permaculture that the authors do not address, probably because

they plan to publish in a biology journal. But this issue is also important from the point of view of providing food for the human communities - and that produced in permaculture is of the highest quality, which is worth emphasising.

Otherwise I have no serious comments on the manuscript. I would, however, suggest that in future publications of this kind I should include an estimate of the costs, not just the profits, or the time spent working in a particular food production system. This time is very roughly estimated by the authors (this is not my caveat, but an observation), as it certainly depends on whether the permaculture is just being established or has been in operation for some time. Again, I will invoke the analogy with nature, whose productivity does not depend on human labour. But it is worth adding that, thanks to this imitation of nature, we do not incur the financial, time, labour costs associated with the use of mineral fertilisers or synthetic pesticides (including their production and the production of equipment for their use). Which in a well-functioning permaculture, as in nature, are simply not needed.