



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_11935
Title of the Manuscript:	SPECIES COMPLEX AND ABUNDANCE OF PANICLE INSECT PESTS OF SORGHUM (<i>Sorghum bicolor</i> (L.) (MOENCH) AT YOLA AND KALTUNGO IN THE NORTH EASTERN 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Remove table 1 and all pictures of insect as attachment, if Journal is promised, Because those data is not the result. Supply the data as : Each vareity or cultivar for one table put into number of 21 insect in each week including 12 weeks. This is important result of the paper. All 8 varieties can clearly show the number change(dynamic) of each insect and more helpful information And present result together to analyse and discuss	I ONLY REMOVED THE PICTURE PLATES AND LEFT TABLE 1 SLIGHTLY MODIFIED.THE PESTS ARE NOT NEW PESTS, BUT THEY ARE RESULTS THAT WAS COLLECTED DURING DATA COLLECTION.THIS PESTS MAY VARY WITH LOCATIONS WITHIN THE COUNTRY.THE CORRESPONDING REVIEWER HAS CARRIED SOME SIMILAR RESEARCH WHILE AT IUAR/ABU ZARIA IN 1993-1997 AND OBTAINED DIFFERENT SPECIES COMPLEX THOUGH EMPHASIS WERE MAINLY ON MIRID HEAD BUGS.THE OTHER TABLES HAS GIVEN SAME RESULTS AS PRESENTED IN THIS STUDY.ALL CORRECTIONS ON PDF ACROBAT ADOBE FILE EFFECTED BUT AS SEPARATE FILE IN MSW DOCUMMENT ORIGINAL COPY SENT ACCORDING TO SDI. DONE ACCORDING TO SCIENCEDOMAI JOURNAL GUIDELINES AND TEMPLATES
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Clear and verify to cite the reference, make sure have read. Each cited 1-2, not too many.	DONE
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Sampling method is not clear. 54*36cm bag for each plant or plot? How many for each plot? According new result, the title of the paper maybe change	HAVE EXPLAINED CLEARLY NOW. HAVE CHANGED TITLE AS SUGGESTED IF YOU



SDI Review Form 1.6

	to another one.	CHECK THE ORIGINAL CRRECTED FILE SNT NOW. THANKS FOR THE POSITIVE CRITCISMS. HAVE FOLLOWED JOURNAL TEMPLATES
--	-----------------	---