



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_43558
Title of the Manuscript:	PRODUCTION COMPONENTS OF THE COWPEA UNDER DIFFERENT DOSES OF ORGANIC FERTILIZER
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:

(<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	Lines 6-8. - Use different sub-section names (Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of the Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion), as given in the MS word SDI paper template. - Put keywords alphabetically! - Key words (cowpea) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word or a synonym or another key words. Line 17. cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp.) Add brackets. Line 50. MATERIAL AND METHODS - This section will include sub-sections. - Specify sowing date - The provenance (place of obtention) of the plant material used in this study was not mentioned. Line 54. The experimental design was of the ... Line 62. Table Lines 110, 124, 140, 151, 177. Table Harmonize! Lines 66, 114. Table 1 Soil ... Table 2 Summary... Line 66. The first row of tables must be in bold. Lines 69, 73, 134, 154. Figure 1. Fig. 1. Figure 2. Fig. 2. Figure 3. Fig. 3. Figure 4. Fig. 4. Figure 5. Fig. 5. Line 132. On the y-axis: Mean pod length (cm) Line 137. MPL ? Line 144. (r=0.709) Line 145. SOM ? Line 152. On the y-axis: Number... Line 158. 15696 15 696 t ha-1 Line 163. Alcântara <i>et al.</i> (2014) The names of the authors in the text must be coded in numeral (ex. [1]) in the text and their correspondence written in the references. Line 173. 10464 10 464 t ha-1 Line 187. W100 ? greater than 20g 20 g Line 191. This work has no prospects Line 199. Authors must follow the guidelines for writing references.	The authors agree that the written summary in this way represents the whole text better. I agree with the reviewer.
Minor REVISION comments	This article is fairly well written. English syntax errors have been detected in the text. Re-reading of the manuscript is recommended. This manuscript is recommended for	I agree with the reviewer.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	minor revision.	
<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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	