

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Journal of Plant & Soil Science |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IJPSS_105267 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Analysis of Parent Offspring Regression of Selected Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> [L.] Walp.) Agronomic Traits in Phosphorus Limiting Soil. |
| 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>)

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>Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community But I find that according to the parameters measured, the results could be developed further</p> <p>The title is pertinent The abstract is well done, therefore comprehensive</p> <p>No. I suggest that we number the sections and separate the results of the discussion</p> <p>The content is scientifically acceptable but underdeveloped</p> <p>The references are sufficient and mostly recent</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Acceptable | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Complete the names of the authors, their affiliations, the contacts of the institute to which you belong, the contact details of the main author...</p> <p>Take into account all the amendments made to the document directly and integrate. Proofread the entire document carefully and correct spelling and vocabulary errors. If necessary, complete these:</p> <p><u>Ethical approval</u></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: | Nerbéwendé Sawadogo |
| Department, University & Country | Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso |