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	The article deals with a simple study, but of local importance. It needs several corrections to be considered suitable for publication. 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! 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. 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. 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. 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. Discussion needs to be improved throughout the manuscript. 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. After making these corrections, I believe that the work will be ready for publication.	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Denis de Pinho Sousa**
Department, University & Country	**Brazil**