



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_25306
Title of the Manuscript:	Synergistic effects of wood ash and essential oil on fecundity, pupal eclosion and adult mortality of Callosobruchus maculatus (Coleoptera: Bruchidae) cowpea seed weevil
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	-Why used the acetone to dissolve the essential oil?	Thank you for the question. It's rather hexane that we used in this experiment. Sorry, it was a typing mistake on our part due to the habits because hexane and acetone are excellent solvents used to dissolve oils in general. In this experiment, hexane has been used and allowed a uniform distribution of essential oil and improved its admixture and adherence on grain surfaces and with wood ash during the treatment. Much thanks for the remark.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Please refer to the comments on the manuscript	In the results of abstract, the LC ₅₀ values have been corrected and the whole sentence reformulated. Excellent insight from the reviewer. We worked tirelessly from the designing of the project to the write up of this paper. We perceived the minor revision made to the manuscript as a great opportunity toward improving the quality of the paper and helping readers and scientists at large to understand better the result outcomes.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please refer to the comments on the manuscript	We really appreciate the celerity and proactiveness of the reviewer. It justifies how devoted and skilled person he is. Although we worked hard to produce the paper, we did not expect such a celerity. We also appreciate the dynamism of the editorial crew of SDI Journal throughout the peer review process. We hope to make SDI our favourite peer review journal for our group. We are heartfully grateful.