

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_125915
Title of the Manuscript:	Analyzing the role of different molybdenum doses and Rhizobium inoculation in optimizing nutrient absorption and yield in vegetable cowpea [<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.] cv. AVCP 1
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 manuscript is about cowpea, which is an important legume for India, specially known for its nutritional properties. In addition, Rhizobium inoculation is also an important issue to study, to develop cheaper and more effective agronomic practices which can substitute nitrogen fertilizers. However, more recent literature is suggested to include in discussion section and language revision. I think the manuscript is relevant for scientific community as well as for Indian cowpea growers.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for the manuscript as it focus on the main idea of the research	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and mention the aim of the work, results and conclusions. However, a brief introduction is needed to introduce cowpea and treatments. If possible, do not include so many values, you can just mention significative comparations. The last sentence of the abstract is incomplete.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections and structure are appropriate, however abbreviations are not described in the title of tables (for ex. S.Em, C.D, and C.V.). Tables should be interpreted by themselves, without the text of the manuscript	
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.	Methods employed for plant analysis are correct and well documented. Statistic design with 12 treatment combinations in a factorial randomized block design is correct with an appropriate number of repetitions. The analysis is complete as they measure yield attributes, nutrient content and nutrient uptake. They analyse the effect of 5 molybdenum doses and Rhizobium inoculation in total yield, phosphorus, potassium and Fe pod content, as well as total nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium uptake for both pod and haulm. I consider that this is a complete analysis, and they have statistic evidence that the effect of both treatments in cowpea nutrient absorption and yield is significant. This information can be used to improve cowpea production in the frame of a sustainable agriculture.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	I suggest including more actualized references (from the las 5 years), and standardize references cited in the text with references in references section. For example, the first paragraph of results and discussion section include 2 references which are not included in references section. References are absent in introduction section. Information presented in that section must also be referenced.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is suitable for scholary communications, however, a revision with a native English speaker, if possible is suggested for a better comprehension of some paragraph or expressions.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Maria Teresa Federici
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Agronomic Research, Uruguay