

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110447
Title of the Manuscript:	Designer seeds and fertilizer microdosing for increased cowpea productivity
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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The application of these techniques aims to enhance the efficiency of input utilization, reduce costs for small farmers with limited resources, and increase the growth and productivity of cowpea cultivation.</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>I believe a seventh point could be included, 'whether the statistical analyses are appropriate.' In this manuscript, the presentation of statistical analyses is not clear, but it can be improved for a better explanation of the treatment effects.</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>In the results, there was extensive discussion regarding the impact of treatments and the comparison of means, including significance. Since quantitative data were obtained from a DBCC with two factors and three repetitions, I believe it would be more advantageous to present the joint variance table explaining the effects of treatments and combinations on the studied variables (which was not provided in the manuscript). The comparison means in Tables 1, 2, and 3 would be more comprehensive and elucidating if presented alongside the letters indicating differences and similarities between treatments, thereby facilitating a more accurate inference of significance</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	César Pedro
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Institute of Mozambique, Mozambique