

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_111344
Title of the Manuscript:	RESPONSE OF SUMMER COWPEA (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L.) TO INORGANIC FERTILIZERS AND FOLIAR APPLICATION OF BIO-ENHANCERS
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)
<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>Yes, the article is important and will further scientific understanding.</p> <p>Yes, I found the title of the article inconsistent and suitable with the body of the manuscript.</p> <p>The abstract explains the subject matter by pointing out the aim, study design, place and duration of study, methodology, results and conclusion. So, yes, it is comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the structure is appropriate and consistent throughout the write-up.</p> <p>I believe the manuscript is scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>Although, references were given, however, I suggest adding more references and recent findings will improve the value of this manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Title: Well-structured and consistent with the manuscript content 2. Abstract: The abstract was well explanatory, however, it should follow the journal's style. 3. Introduction: Should be a little bit discuss further with more latest citations. 4. Materials and method: Well-constructed. 5. Results and discussion were provided with deep understanding and using graphical and tabular illustration. 6. An acceptable conclusion was presented. 7. References: There is the need for provision of recent references at least from 2019-2024 and including more citations to support current findings 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language is appropriate for scientific and academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This paper offers a justification and description of the topic supported by experimental data. I suggest it to be published with minor corrections.</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:	Bilal Ibrahim Dan-lya
Department, University & Country	Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia