

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT COPPER CONCENTRATION ON GROWTH AND NODULATION OF GREEN GRAM (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

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 manuscript is an interesting one. The authors improved on existing knowledge by investigating the effect of an essential micronutrient, copper on the growth and nodulation of green gram which is a deviation from the conventional studies that focus on improving growth through supplemental macro-element addition either in forms of organic or inorganic fertilizers. An interesting finding was that lower concentration of Cu enhanced growth and nodulation of green gram which confirmed the definition of a micronutrient	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	suitable	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction is too scanty. The authors left out detailed information about previously done studies on green gram involving fertilizer treatment, which their research is building on. Introduction should be improved, and references updated. Some suggested references are in the main manuscript Sub titles in results section were not properly captured	
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 background of the study was adequate Materials and methods are scientifically correct Interpretation of results was technically sound Discussion was lacking detail	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Authors should improve their citations in introduction and discussion	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor grammar check required	
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:	Uchenna Noble Ukwu
Department, University & Country	University of Nigeria, Nigeria