

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_108304
Title of the Manuscript:	Productivity of dry grains of cowpea {Vigna unguiculata (L.)} Creole cultivar (Canupum), as a function of different planting densities.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
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)	The author used randomized complete blocks with five treatments (1.0; 2.0; 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0 plants hole-1) with four replications. Each plot consisted of dimensions of 3.5 m x 4.8 m, with six rows of 4.8 m in length, with a total area of 18.2 m ² , with the useful area being the four central rows, with dimensions of 2.8 x 4.8 m, with an area of 13.44 m ² , for collecting dry grains. As a result the highest grain productivity was influenced by planting densities, with the density of three plants per pit being the one that resulted in the highest productivity (405.8 kg ha ⁻¹). For the characteristic weight of 100 dry grains, the density of one plant per hole was the one that promoted the highest average weight with a maximum value of 28.24 g. The experiment is shown step by step and growth time by time. The study looks useful. References match and title is also suit the manuscript. The paper can be published.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Yashwant Singh
Department, University & Country	Government College, India