

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_99067
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of Rhizobium and Virus Inocula on Growth and Yields of Cowpea: a mini-review
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Cowpea [<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp] is an important crop for smallholder farmers in the marginal areas of sub-Saharan Africa. However, the crop growth and production are affected by low soil fertility due to poor soil management practices. Native rhizobia inoculated on different legumes including cowpea, common bean, green grams, soybean, and lentils have enhanced legume productivity. Hence the current research has great importance in scientific community. 2. Yes, the title of the manuscript is fine. 3. Yes, the abstract of the article is ok. 4. The structure of the manuscript is also good. 5. Yes, there is no scientific issue in this manuscript. 6. References are sufficient. See the attachment	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language Should be improve Need to check typos and spelling	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bilqees Fatima
Department, University & Country	Minhaj University, Pakistan