



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_33540
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth, nodulation and nutrients content of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) following Zinc fertilizer rates in the semi-deciduous forest zone of Ghana
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>)



SDI 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	<p>I have some important difficulties about the methodology.</p> <p>First: For me, authors of the manuscript have measured N-uptake by cowpea varieties and not N-fixed for the following reason: N-uptake can be provided either by atmosphere (N-fixed) or by N-urea applied in the soil (see line 68) or from mineral N after organic matter decomposition in the soil. Authors have evaluated all N content in grain or haulm. So, there is not N-fixed but N-uptake.</p> <p>Secondly: From line 92 to 95, authors write about some N-difference. Difference between what nitrogen and what nitrogen? Also, they write about some maize. Where this maize had been planted in the field? I think that they must provide more explanation for the methodology. They can explain more what reference [13] had done.</p> <p>Thirdly. Line 168. There is no harvest index in the table 3. Authors must indicated how they calculated this parameter.</p> <p>Please clarify the ethical issue if any</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>ABSTRACT</p> <p>1. Line 7. The effect of Zinc rates applications on growth</p> <p>2. Line 8: nodulation and nutrient content uptakes of cowpea was</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

3. **Line 13.** split plot design was used for both ~~studies~~ **seasons**.
4. **Line 14 to 15:** Authors write that: The result indicated that all yield components increased significantly following Zn fertilizer application. **This is not true.** Please, see line 124 to 126: Analysis of variance showed no significant effect of Zn fertilizer on plant height and leaf production.
5. **Line 15 to 16:** Application of Zn fertilizer improved the N and K ~~content of~~ **uptakes** by cowpea seeds.
6. Line 16. This implies **that** the Zinc rates used can be applied to any of the varieties used. **(I think that this recommendation must be deleted and authors will propose at the end of the Abstract one Zn application rate taking into account economic considerations. For example, if there is no significant difference between 5 and 10 kg/ha, 5 kg/ha would be recommended to farmers)**
7. **Line 20 to 21.** The amount of nodule dry biomass was drastically reduced with the mineral Zinc fertilizer, whereas the amount of nodule biomass was not affected in the control group **(verify that if this is true on Table 2.**

METHODOLOGY

1. **Line 59 to 60.** Please, add the number of repetitions

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

If possible, please, indicate the model.

RESULTS

1. Line 126 to 127. Please, delete this sentence: **However, plots with Zn application had the tallest plants compare to the control.**
2. Line 157; Please, verify this sentence: **The Zinc levels are increased the cowpea grain yield in the order:**
3. Line 161 to 162. ~~400~~ **One hundred** seed weights were different at 5% level of probability. One hundred seeds
4. Line 164 to 165. Similarly, cowpea varieties did significant ($P < 0.05$) affect the cowpea biomass



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments	<p>TITLE. Growth, nodulation and nutrient content of uptakes by cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i> (L.) Walp) following Zinc fertilizer rates applications in the semi-deciduous forest zone of Ghana</p>	

PART 2:

<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Any</p>
<p>Are there competing interest issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>Any</p>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Adjolohoun Sébastien</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Abomey, Benin</i>