

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Applied Life Sciences International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JALSI_84701
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Some Fungal and Bacterial Organisms on the Growth of Cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) Seedlings
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.journaljalsi.com/index.php/JALSI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The work presents important information, however, it needs some alterations for better understanding and valorization of the presented information.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The work presents important information, however, here are some suggestions for contribution in the writing and reading of the article: Introduction: the authors should pay attention to better writing, valuing the work and addressing the importance of diseases for the culture of cowpea, a fact that does not occur in the text. The paragraphs are written without much connection between them, making reading confusing. Methodology: as the research works with fungi and bacteria, it would be interesting to use broad terms for the subheadings (2.1 Source of microorganisms or pathogens). As the research addresses 8 pathogenic agents, the genera and species should be cited only once in the text in full, and the others with the abbreviated genus - see suggestions in the article). Results and Discussion: I consider item 3.1 and its table unnecessary. The information presented is incomplete, not considering the 8 pathogens and irrelevant to the study. Figures 2 and 3 do not have captions on the "Y" axes - insert. The discussion deserves more attention. Conclusion: it presents a lot of text that could fit in the discussion. This topic should pay attention only to the "answers" of the objective. Much of this text fits the discussion. See suggestions in the text	The introduction has been re-structured on page 2 The subheading "2.1" has been re-named on page 2 The genera have been abbreviated on other pages except at first occurrence. The table and the accompanying text referring to the table under sub-heading 3.1 has been removed. Captions have been added to "Y" axis of Figures 2 and 3 on pages 5 and 6. Some information has been added to the discussion on page 10. Corrections have been made on the conclusion on page 10.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work must be published with suggested adjustments for greater appreciation of the work and results obtained.	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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>	