



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_43691
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of Lead on Different Seedling Growth Attributes of Cow Pea (Vigna unguiculata)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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 results of the authors indicated that lead inhibited seedling growth parameters of Cow Pea, which is a useful legume in Pakistan. I made some correction as follow: From abstract Results, in Line 3, add ppm after 100. From abstract Results, in Line 4, add X? % before REDUCTION . From abstract Results, in Line 6, add X %? before REDUCTION . From abstract Results, in Line 9, add X % REDUCTION before ON SEEDLING . The phrase "80 ppm was found sufficient to cause significant reductions in seedling dry weight of <i>V. unguiculata</i> as compared with control." Change by "80 ppm causes X? % reduction in seedling dry weight of <i>V. unguiculata</i> as compared to control." The phrase "the lowest (6450 %) at 80 of lead treatment. <i>V. unguiculata</i> seedlings showed better percentage of tolerance 73.25 % to lead at 60 ppm." Change by "The lowest <i>V. unguiculata</i> seedlings was 64.50 % at 80 ppm of lead, but better tolerance of <i>V. unguiculata</i> seedlings by 73.25 % at 60 ppm of lead."	Corrected in manuscript and indicated with yellow font in colour.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		Thank you for the helping in improving the manuscript.

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)	