

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_121594
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of rooster tree (<i>Calotropis procera</i>) mixed with cattle manure in cowpea productivity in the semi-arid region of Brazil.
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript dealt with the subject of organic fertilization using plant and animal waste, which is an important and essential topic in maximizing production</p> <p>Cowpea production is part of the agricultural activities of important farmers in the semi-arid region of Brazil and farmers depend on it for income and food source and in this sense the researcher suggested, the use of the rooster tree (<i>Calotropis procera</i>) mixed with cattle manure in the productivity of cowpea in the semi-arid region in Brazil because of its good effect in increasing production and improving soil properties with low economic cost compared to other fertilizers. Thus, the researcher has provided a great service to farmers to improve production in quantity and quality.</p> <p>From a scientific point of view, the manuscript is good, and the researcher has followed the scientific method recognized in conducting the experiment, the researcher made a great effort, he identified the research problem, chose the appropriate treatments, collected data, analyzed the data, followed the appropriate statistical design and reached acceptable and logical results, and he discussed them clearly and scientifically.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is good, but I suggestion to be: The effect of using compost on cowpea productivity in the semi-arid region of Brazil</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is good, comprehensive and written in a scientific way and the results were arranged very well</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and structure of the manuscript are good appropriate</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript from a good scientific point of view has followed the researcher scientific style recognized in conducting the experiment has identified the problem of research and chose the appropriate treatment and collect data and analyses data and follow the appropriate statistical design and reached acceptable and logical results has been discussed clearly and scientifically</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The researcher cited a large number of recent references and the previous study has covered the subject of the research very well I recommend that the researcher adhere to one way to classify references</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is good and suitable for scholarly communications	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The charts are unclear I suggest changing the shape of the charts with a clearer one- Previous studies have not been cited in the discussion of the results- Add keywords in the abstract- The need to mention the tables of results in the discussion	

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:	Shaker Babiker Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Omdurman Islamic University (OIU), Sudan