

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 (Meloidogyne spp.) and Rhizobium nodulation of cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L. Walp)
Type of the Article	Short Research Articles

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>1. Correct and complete the sentences I have commented on in my notes.</p> <p>- presence of -, - Eco-friendly management like use of botanicals amendment against root-knot nematodes.</p> <p>2. The interpretation of graphs should be done in the part of results and discussions while in the part of conclusions no notes should be place as Fig. 1</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>1. The names of the chemical elements must also be written with symbols.</p> <p>- iron (Fe), zinc (Zn), calcium (Ca), magnesium (Mg), potassium (K), phosphorus (P)</p> <p>Remove the simbls @ and + and replace the right words and signs</p> <p>- T₆ farmyard manure @ 8t/ha + spent mushroom compost @ 8t/ha + drumstick leaf waste @ 8t/ha</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>1. As a reviewer, since this scientific article has a limited number of literature (18) as well as figures and tables, I think it should be considered Short Research Articles. It has a length of 2458 words, 2 figures and 3 tables, these values are enough to be a short research article. Also, it is an experiment on agriculture work.</p> <p>2. The material is well worked scientifically and the stages through which a scientific work passes are generally respected.</p>	

Comment [U1]: ????? whose presence?

Comment [U2]: Presence of -????????

Comment [U3]: iron (Fe)

Comment [U4]: zinc (Zn)

Comment [U5]: calcium (Ca)

Comment [U6]: magnesium (Mg)

Comment [U7]: potassium (K)

Comment [U8]: phosphorus (P)

Comment [U9]: Remove the simbls @ and + and replace the right words and signs T₆(farmyard manure80t/ha, spent mushrooms compost and)

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>In the submitted manuscript, in the position of reviewer, I do not see any problems regarding ethics. Thus, the author has presented an original work being comfortable applying the rules of ethics. The manuscript has not been published before in another scientific journal.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nikoleta Kallajxhiu
Department, University & Country	University of Elbasan “Aleksandër Xhuvani”, Albania