

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_83001
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of compost on Root-knot nematode (<i>Meloidogyne</i> spp.) and Rhizobium nodulation of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> L. Walp)
Type of the 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>)

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 author has followed and adopted the appropriate methods for conducting the experiment. The data are well presented in result section. The use of botanical is one of the good alternatives for management of nematode in present scenario of organic agriculture. Further study on best treatment in relation to soil parameter will give a insight to management of plant parasitic nematodes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Few minor corrections required which are mentioned in the manuscript. In result section photograph of infective juvenile is missing. Authors should be careful while using a term to describe a particular stage of nematodes . Morphological description of female (eg. forms perineal patterns, short stylet with well-developed basal knobs) is not required as it's not a part of the manuscript. In discussion section only one reference is given which is also very old (1999) . There are many recent references on management of nematodes by using the botanicals. It will be good if author would include few more references to justify his study. The paper is good and has insight and can be considered for publication after above mentioned corrections.	
<u>Optional/General</u> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nibedita Borgohain
Department, University & Country	Assam Agricultural University, India