

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128092
Title of the Manuscript:	Proximates and Mineral Composition Profiling in Cowpea ((Vigna unduiculata LWalp.)
Type of the Article	research

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The idea of this research is a good one. Authors aimed at checking different cultivars / genotypes of cowpea for their nutritional content, with a view to identify the genotype that will give best nutrition to consumers, and to enhance the efforts of breeders for genetic improvement of cowpea.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is not robust enough. A better title has been suggested: Proximate and Mineral composition profiling in different cultivars of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L Walp	
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.	In my opinion, the abstract is not comprehensive. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No clear cut methodology mentioned 2. Results not well explained 3. Conclusion does not match the aim of the study 4. I SUGGEST A COMPLETE OVERHAUL OF THE ABSTRACT 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Not really. There is no clear cut control in this work. Author should indicate the control sample, and compare the test samples with the control for a meaningful result and robust discussion Also, in the result section, I suggest that the Table 1 be broken into three tables: Proximate, Macro minerals, Micro-minerals The statistical analyses should be rerun, to show what was used to analyse the data, and what was used to segregate the means. A lot has to	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No. I have indicated where more references are needed	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion, the manuscript need general overhauling if it will be published.	

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:	Taiwo olanipekun
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria