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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is valuable to the scientific community because it addresses the impact of Cowpea mottle virus (CPMoV) on various cowpea cultivars, a significant issue for crop production in Nigeria and other regions where cowpeas are a staple. By identifying cultivars with resistant traits, such as Langbazo and IT07K-277-2, it provides a foundation for breeding programs aimed at developing virus-resistant and high-yielding cowpea varieties. The study's clear experimental design and its contribution to sustainable agriculture make it an important resource for further research. |  |
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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear research objective and well-structured experimental design. The study utilizes appropriate methodologies, such as Complete Randomised Design (CRD) and proper inoculation techniques, to evaluate the resistance of cowpea cultivars against Cowpea Mottle Virus (CPMoV). The use of enzyme assays to assess plant defense mechanisms, including peroxidase and polyphenol oxidase activity, is relevant and adds depth to the investigation of cultivar resistance. The inclusion of statistical analysis ensures that the results are both significant and reliable, providing a solid basis for the conclusions drawn. |  |
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