



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_10474
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of Microwave irradiation on the postharvest control of Cowpea Bruchid, (<i>Callosbruchus maculatus</i>) Coleoptera:Bruchidae on stored cowpea
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	My detailed observations are appendixes on the last few pages, please refer to them Appendix (detailed comments) Abstract-Ok as presented. Key words-Arrange key words in alphabetical order (optional). Line 27 cowpea and not Cowpea Line 41 Methods and not methods Line 43 purchased and not purchase Line 64 and 65 Number of emerged seeds Number of seeds planted And not Number of seeds planted Number of emerged seeds Line 71 control of the and not control on the Throughout the text (except in the tables) where treatment (s) is mentioned like in lines 74, 81, 82, 83, 102, 103, 116, 125, 126, 129, 135, 137, 141, etc they should be defined. In short avoid the use of treatment(s) in the text. It will be odd for citation. For example lines 72 and 73 should read All the exposure periods 6, 8, and 10 minutes significantly ($p < 0.05$) differed from the control except insects exposed to 2	The keywords have been arranged in alphabetical order. Lines 27, 41, 43, 64, 65, 71 have been corrected. Throughout the text, treatments have been replaced as suggested by the reviewer. They are marked yellow.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	minutes and 4 minutes and not All the treatments significantly ($p < 0.05$) differed from the control except insects exposed to 2 minutes and 4 minutes Lines 94, 112, 152, 217 Table-: and not Table-. Line 106 has and not was Lines 107 and 108 this experiment has been conducted why use future tense (will kill) Line 147 Similar and not Similarly Line 187 There was and not The was Line 195 Henshaw (2008) not in the references Lines 277 to 289 are not in the text	Lines 94,112,152,217,106,107,108, 147,187 have been corrected. Henshaw 2008 in the reference has been listed. Lines 277 and 289 that were not in the text has been removed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Corrections have been pointed which requires attentions.	The corrections pointed out have been effected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The research work will go along in solving the perennial problems of cowpea especially with emphasise on the non chemical storage of the vital crop.	