

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126058
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Zn Concentrations on Root nodulation in Yard-long bean (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study can be important to the soil fertility assessment and plant growth adjustment for improving the crop production and productivity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Effect of Different Zn Concentrations on Root nodulation and plant growth in Yard-long bean (Vigna unguiculata L.)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It must be improved after having a good discussion and conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Some corrections needed	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	A similar way was used in all points interpreted, which is not good.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	In the text, there are more missing references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Moderate	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript revision needed	

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:	Havugimana Sylvestre
Department, University & Country	Rwanda Polytechnic – Karongi College, Rwanda