

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_123804
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of nipping and hormonal spray on growth parameters and seed yield in cowpea variety (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Research 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 (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 information on nipping and hormones helped in improving the growth and yield parameters. Hence, this information is useful especially in cow pea	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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 data mentioned in the abstract is not similar to the table data. Kindly check the data	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Need to be write properly	
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.	The scientific reason for the results obtained need to be elaborated. Present area, production and productivity need to be revised as it contains 2014 data (Its 10 year old).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Need to be add some more reference which are relevant to the topic	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Fair. Need to be improved	
Optional/General comments	Lot of grammatical and data corrections need to be attended	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sadashiv V Nadukeri
Department, University & Country	KSN University of Agricultural and Horticultural Sciences, India