

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_98170
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Zinc levels on growth and yield of cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L.) Varieties
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. I consider the summary very succinct, it did not make it clear at the beginning what the purpose of the research is. I also missed a conclusion or possible faults that led to the results found. The abstract was limited to describing part of the methodology and some results. There is a need for correction.</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>6. There is a need for additions to the references to make the work robust.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction Very summarized and without developing a line of thought for the work that leads the reader to follow the reasons for the development of the work. It is not possible to be sure what the researcher wants with the research. First paragraph too long and without bibliographical references. Excessive zinc also causes problems for the biota, there was a lack of a good paragraph referencing this. I consider the introduction shallow and with few references. There is a great need for correction to make the work robust.</p> <p>Material and methods There was a lack of greater detailing of the place where the experiment took place, physical-chemical conditions, climate typical of the region, a figure with the map and georeferencing. Was there already zinc in the study area? How much? Could other nutrients have influenced the result? How many seeds were planted? How was the control done? It was watered, wasn't it? A meticulous rewrite of the methodology needs to be carried out so that there is no doubt about how everything was done.</p> <p>Results It was not detailed in the methodology which statistical analyzes were performed. It cannot be said that the changes are significant without these analyses. Claims of dubious results, few references to standard strengthening. Without detailed analysis of the other soil nutrients, and detailing of the research standardization, it leads to disbelief. Graphs with standard deviation are necessary for each of the analyzed points.</p> <p>Conclusion Shallow, little theoretical and comparative base.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rômulo José Ramos
Department, University & Country	University of Vila Velha, Brazil