



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_34265
Title of the Manuscript:	Alterations Induced by Cowpea Weevil <i>Callosobruhus maculatus</i> F. (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae) Infestation on Seed Germination Potential and Nutrient Quality of <i>Vigna aconitifolia</i> (Jacq.)
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 2, Introduction; Line no. 28-29: Delete the sentence 'The life cycle ofan adult stage' In this study, the damaged seeds were collected from market and the authors grouped them into different categories based on the level of seed damage and studied the germination potential. Besides <i>C. maculatus</i>, some other <i>Callosobruchus</i> spp. and other genera can also make holes in cow pea seeds. How did the author confirm that the seed damage was caused by <i>C. maculatus</i> only? The authors should clarify this point. Caption of Table 1 should be modified as 'Mean germination of <i>V. aconitifolia</i> seeds infested by <i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i> at various levels in three different soil types' Caption of Table 2 should be modified as 'Percentage germination of <i>V. aconitifolia</i> seeds infested by <i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i> at various levels in three different soil types' Both Tables 1 and 2 present same results. So any one table should be deleted. In table 3, the authors have compared the means of proximate nutrient values (moisture, ash, protein, fat, fibre and carbohydrate) (i.e., within each column) for statistical significance by Duncan's multiple range test. Actually the proximate nutrient values in a seed must vary. So the different nutrient values should not be 	<p>Line 28-29; The sentence has been deleted</p> <p>This has been effected.</p> <p>Captions have been modified.</p> <p>Table 2 has been deleted as suggested.</p> <p>The significance of damaged seeds germination has been investigated.</p> <p>The impact of soil types on seed germination has been treated.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	statistically compared among themselves; the significance between germination of damaged seeds should be found out. Moreover the impact of three different soil types on seed germination should also be statistically compared.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Page 1, Abstract; Line no. 13: 'induce' should be corrected as 'induced' Page 1, Line no. 16: insert the word 'the' between 'was' and 'highest' Page 2, Introduction; Line no. 34: 'insect pest infests' should be changed as 'insect pests infest'	Effectuated Treated Treated
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There are many grammatical errors. The corrections should be carefully done and the manuscript should be resubmitted.	A proper check has been done.