

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_85687
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of molybdenum and bio-fertilizers on growth and yield of cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The article deals with a simple study, but of local importance. It needs several corrections to be considered suitable for publication.</p> <p>Authors must make it clear to readers what the hypothesis of the study is and what its objective is. And that's not in the manuscript!</p> <p>Authors should reference the paragraphs. Several sentences written by them have already been said by other authors, so to avoid it being considered plagiarism, I recommend that it be redone carefully, especially the entire introduction.</p> <p>Authors should rewrite the methodology used. More details should be added on how measurements and material collections were carried out to evaluate productivity and harvest index.</p> <p>Authors talk about economic analysis, but do not describe any details. Remove this part as it is not up to you to talk about what was not evaluated. Include a test of means (Tukey) to compare if there was a statistical difference between the treatments evaluated and only then you could say which was the best among the evaluated ones.</p> <p>The results need to be further explored. Only a simple description of the main findings is given. Improve this and discuss each of the parameters that were evaluated.</p> <p>Discussion needs to be improved throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>References inserted in the list do not count in the text. Authors should include it in the text or remove it from the list of references.</p> <p>After making these corrections, I believe that the work will be ready for publication.</p>	<p>All the corrections were made accordingly and submitted. Thankyou for improving the fineness of the research paper</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	No such issues