

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_112968
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of organic manures and bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of kharif cowpea [Vignaunguiculata (L.)]
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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>The MS is important only for regional use</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes, see comments</p> <p>yes</p> <p>see comments</p> <p>yes</p> <p>The MS shows too many limitations and omissions which need to be solved before considering its publication. Moreover, the use of the regional terminology is confusing and not proper. The pages and the lines must be numerated (in order to the reviewers use) Abstract: a) the country name must be mentioned; b) the treatments list is out of context because they are too many, and the acronyms have not been defined; c) the regional names are not understandable for all readers; d) what is the "@" meaning? is it a commercial mark? is it a dose? e) the conclusions and agricultural recommendation are absent. Keywords: the "Jeevamrut" word is not possible to understand Introduction Many aspects must be improved: a) the cowpea scientific name must be added (at the first mention in the text); b) the "bio-fertilizers" use and type must be mentioned and justified; c) the "FYM" acronym lacks the definition; d) the MS objective is absent. Methods: The first paragraph shows too many limitations and omissions: a) the experimental site name is unnecessarily detailed: please, short it and add the country name; b) the "bio-fertilizers" have not been mentioned before; c) the title must not be repeated; d) the kharif season months must be mentioned; e) the treatments description must be included in a table; e) the units do not agree with the international units systems: for example, change organic C % by "g kg-1, "t/ha" by "t ha-1", etc.; f) all acronyms (PSB, RDF, FYM) need the reference and description; g) How was the "castor cake" obtained? the castor scientific name must be added; h) the plots size must be included; i) the climatic conditions are need; j) the sowing procedure (row width and seeds per row), and crop management must be described. Second and third paragraphs: a) the "bio-enhancers" word has not been mentioned before: does it refer to the "bio-fertilizers"? b) the "bio-enhancers" names are nor compressible for all readers; what is their meaning? c) the "bio-enhancers" terminology is not unified: for example: "Bijamrut" vs. "Beejamrut"; "Jivamrut" vs. "Jeevamrut"; d) is the "Take" word necessary? e) the "handful soil from the bund of farm" is very ambiguous component; f) again, change "gm" by "g"; g) how was the urine "deshi"? h) the "jaggery" and "sajiv" words need explanation. Page 3, second paragraph: a) what is the "desi cow dung" meaning? b) does the "Jivamrut" refer to the previous preparation? Page 3, 4th paragraph: the parameters measured must be mentioned and their techniques described. According to the results, group them in the grown and yield parameters. The sampling design is absent (for example, dates, plant amount sampled, etc)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Results The wording of this section is not proper, please rewrite it according to the followings aspects: a) the “plant population” result is meaningless because the seeds per row has not been mentioned; b) the parameters and sampling dates (30, 45, 60 days and harvest), must be moved to the method section (see above comments); c) in the results description (for all parameters), the treatments components must not be included. please use only the treatment acronyms (T1...T9); d) the values which are shown in the tables must not be repeated in the text; e) the “DAS” acronym needs explanation; f) how was the “seed index” calculated? g) how was the seed protein content measured? and many more. tables 1 and 2: all references are absent. In order to more easy results reading, the statistical differences among treatments must be highlighted with letters.</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>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adriana Abril
Department, University & Country	Cordoba University, Argentina