SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**American Journal of Experimental Agriculture**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJEA_19988**
Title of the Manuscript:	**COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF HOE-WEEDING AND PENDIMETHALIN SPRAY REGIMES ON WEED MANAGEMENT IN COWPEA (VIGNA UNGUICULATA (L) WALP.) IN NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA**
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)

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	**The author did a good piece of agronomic work having some importance for cowpea cultivation. However the manuscript has not been base on sufficient experimental evidences**	I am happy this reviewer commended the good agronomic work with some importance to cowpea cultivation. The experimental evidences were clear in this work. This had been pointed out by the other reviewers.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		