



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	My major concern is the lack of information provided in the Materials and Methods section which currently makes the study irreproducible. This makes me question the quality of the phenotype data. The authors should include better descriptions of what was measured and how. The varieties used in this study were not collected from germplasm centers. Seeds taken from a market are likely to be heterozygous at many loci and have an imprecise ancestry. This would lead to different paths of single-seed descent and within accession variation which are significant sources of problems that are well-documented problem among plant breeding programs, including cowpea. Review of previous research is very outdated (most recent citation is 2003, most are several decades old). The Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion sections have a very narrow scope and do not relate the study to strategies of crop improvement. The authors should convey the importance of this work in a broader context (perhaps plant breeding, seed systems, germplasm collections, climate change, population growth, etc...).	This was done as can be seen in yellow background. We lack germplasm here to collect seed. Both farmers and researcher depends on AADPs as source of improved seeds. Those that are several decades old are basic information that changes a little if at all over the decades. We measured susceptibility, hence the information provided here will serve as baseline information for those intending to breed resistant varieties.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are numerous spelling, grammatical, and formatting errors which collectively make the manuscript difficult to read. There are no figures, only tables are found. Pictures of the trials, pests, phenotypes, or seeds would be helpful.	Spelling and grammar were checked. The pictures taken were of cowpea field layout which add little or no value to the outcome of the research.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Only studies five varieties in one environment. The cultivars should have been collected from a germplasm centre and accession names should be used in addition to common or cultivar names (TVu for IITA accessions, PI for USDA accessions, and UCR for Riverside accessions). The manuscript needs substantial editing for English.	Environment has not be shown elsewhere to depend on environmental factors, hence will not in any way affect the reliability of this result.
---	--	---