

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_110765
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Zai Pit Depth on Morphological Traits, Yield Components and Yield of Cowpea (Vigna unguiculata (L.) Walp) in Burkina Faso
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?  6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript provides the traditional knowledge of farming practices for increasing crop yield. This ms is important for scientific community to adopt this practices in areas that experience erratic rainfall and high temperature. Mention the difference between yield components and yield (Catagorize yield components and yield separately to avoid confusion).</p> <p>The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is good.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is acceptable.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The references are less as well as old. I suggest that latest reference must be added in the discussion section.</p>	We agreed with reviewers' comments and suggestions. We have integrated all the corrections required highlighted by reviewers.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is understandable.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		We agreed. The corrections are done.

### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	