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	Organic fertiliser is inappropriately used as a synonym for organic compost. The distinction between compost and manure such as poultry manure (e.g. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272457981_Effects_of_organic_manure_and_cowpea_Vigna_unguiculata_l_Walp_varieties_on_the_chemical_properties_of_the_soil_and_root_nodulation) is important since it may strongly affect the outcome of the fertilisation. In particular, the abstract and the conclusion should highlight the distinction and in the conclusion a comparison between compost and other organic fertilisers could be made. 149 the good fit to a quadratic dependence must be fortuitous considering the lack of significance between 15.21 and 20.48 versus 17.7. A quadratic dependence might be consistent with the data but so might also a linear one. The mentioned lack of significance does not match the CV of 11.21 % if the CV refers to the total variation across all treatments, hence it is important to state what the CV refers to	
Minor REVISION comments	The instructions for authors recommend the statement of doi in the reference list. It greatly facilitates analysis of the article. Also web reference helps the reader. Mg and ton are used inconsistenly, why not use Mg throughout? Text in Portuguese in table 1 should be replace by English text Table 2: • the unit um need to be spelt out (dimensionless?). • The seemingly significant variation among blocks of the NPP should be commented upon Comments by line number: 118 absolute control is not defined, it appears that the comparison is with the mineral treatment 127 ...length consistent with a linear… (could be consistent with many other responses) 142 superior implies a value judgment; the values found were higher than …. 143 The reference for grading of the correlation coefficient should be given (e.g. Table 1 of https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3576830/#R4); such grading is a rule of thumb and my quoted reference suggests interpretation as moderately positive for the interval 0.5 to 0.7 and high positive for 0.7 to 0.9; the wording moderately for 0.64 and strong for 0.71 gives an exaggerated impression of the relative strength of the two correlations. Maybe *strong* could be replaced by *somewhat higher*? 145 SOM is an abbreviation not explained (soil organic matter?) nor necessary since it is only used in this place 148 reference needed for the statement about S, Zn and B	

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:	***Gunnar Bengtsson***
Department, University & Country	***Sweden***