



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_5780
Title of the Manuscript:	Differential Susceptibility of some Cowpea Varieties to Field infestation by Arthropod Pests in Mubi region of Sudan Savannah ecological zone of Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Research 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 50: "Therefore, until transgenic insect resistant cowpea has been developed through biotechnology," Sentence should begin, "Integrated pest management . . . (Alabi <i>et al.</i>, 2003). The Alabi article does not mention transgenic techniques, and the article under review does not offer any data to demonstrate that transgenic techniques will be superior to IPM. Lines 256-258: "This means that, in the face of pest infestation, variety that produced the highest yield /hectare and hence could be concluded that." This is a key sentence that makes no sense. Revise and complete the sentence so that the reader does not have to guess. Lines 269-274: Again, this is a key section that is poorly written. The conclusions need to be completely re-written to be clear, concise and consistent with the data analysis.	Agreed and Changed appropriately. Necessary changes effected This section has been improved as suggested
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In general, the style is grammatically and syntactically awkward. The text should be copy-edited. I will not make style suggestions or offer a comprehensive list of grammatical errors, but I will point out a few. Line 62: Should read "However, improper application of these pesticides . . ." Line 63: Perkins (1982) does not appear in the References section. Either add the reference (preferred) or eliminate the citation in the text.	It has been copy-edited in the template attached. Changes recommended applied This was addressed.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 141: Singh and Allen (1978) does not appear in the References section. Add the reference. addressed Line 151: should be "Duncan's Multiple Range Test . . ." Line 155: should be "RESULTS" ADDRESSED This error is repeated below. Lines 194-199: The "4:8" on line 194 is confusing. As above, more than one result is being presented. This whole section is important and needs to be expanded. What does it signify? Populations or scouting results are not given. Were there varietal differences in the populations? Did some insects prefer others? Not RELEvant to the objecties Line 224: Incomplete sentence.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Lines 69-153: The description of materials and methods is very jerky and does not flow very well. Perhaps a table that describes the parameters and data collection procedures would be better. Tables 1, 2 and 3 could be combined and / or expressed as bar graphs. The whole data section is a bit repetitive and the narrative is not particularly well written.	It has been improved Data can be presented in any format without affecting the objectives of research or the useful to the end users