

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Journal of Scientific Research and Reports  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JSRR_118691  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | RESPONSE OF SULPHUR AND ZINC ON YIELD ATTRIBUTES , YIELD AND ECONOMICS OF COWPEA (Vigna unguiculata L.) |
| 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?<br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?<br/>(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</p> <p>YES</p> <p>NO</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>YES</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>  | <p>YES</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>  | <p>Arrange the abstract according to standard guidelines.<br/>Conclusion is missing<br/>All graphs should be identical</p> |   |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name:                            | <b>Atul R. Bendale</b>                               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Dr. Babasaheb Technological University, India</b> |