



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_31869
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of Cassia mimosoides leaf extracts against the weevil Callosobruchus maculatus and nutritional and organoleptic quality assessment of the treated Vigna subterranea (L.) Verdc
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	The manuscript is poorly written on all aspects of it. 1. The use of English is problem, I therefore suggest that the MS be submitted to other facilities that can proof read in terms of English. 2. The use of wrong spellings throughout the MS. Please refer to the MS, I have highlighted some. 3. The authors must do spell check before submitting an article. 4. The objective of the study is not clear to understand, it is also different from Abstract and Introduction. 5. On some sentences there are full stops at the end. Please refer to the MS 6. Reduce of long sentences	1. For English problem, the manuscript was revised once again to improve it. 2. Wrong spelling were also corrected as suggested in MS 3. Spelling checked 4. the objective was rephrase (see manuscript) 5. Sentences full stop was corrected. 6. Long sentences were also reduced in the manuscript
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Many of my comments are in the MS, please refer to it.	Corrections were made as suggested in manuscript
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I suggest a lot of revision on all aspect especially English and use of long sentences which are not easy to understand.	Overall revision was made.