



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_6229
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of cropping pattern systems on incidence of Scab and Septoria leaf spot disease of cowpea (<i>Vigna unguiculata</i>)
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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	1. The author in Materials and methods didn't explain the inoculation procedures and should be clear on how he/she was able to handle the two pathogens from Collection, isolation, identification and inoculation and if the procedure is the same he/she should say so and if there was no inoculation why preparation of inoculums was done? 2. The author explained the gap to be in field conditions, my suggestion was to use really field conditions (e.g. should not bother about inoculums and instead do the experiment in hot spot areas for the two diseases 3. In results section the author in line 112 to 114 mentioned "irrespective of the cropping pattern and cowpea variety used" For cropping pattern it is ok but there are no data for proof of cowpea variety used as there was only one variety used in this study, so the author should check on this. 4. The word "decreasing order" means from high to low but the author used it and put from low to high...far as much the signs < are correct but the meaning of decreasing order is distorted, so i suggest the author changes this to fit decreasing order like in line 243 though the trend may change e.g. in line 21 and 22 (Abstract) decreasing order should be Inter-row>strip>double row....>intra row>sole for septoria leaf spot.	OK OK OK OK



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. The variety Ife brown was used with a reason i think and would be better for the author to say something about that. (May be it is the market class variety or any other reason, the readers would wish to know why Ife brown?) 2. The author should be consistent in his/her write up...e.g. using Sole and Monocrope It is better for him/her to choose which one to use and use it throughout. 3. the author should check grammar and small typo mistakes and correct accordingly including follow the instructions for authors properly	OK OK OK
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The work is good and to my view it has enough data to be published though it is a routine work (It lacks speciality/novelty) – I just say this knowing that it is not important as far as your publication criteria are concerned, this will help the author to thirst for discovering new things and knowledge wanting his/her future work to be special and peculiar bringing out new insights.	OK