



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</u>
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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Editorial comments	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	1. Provide the author citation of C. mimosoides 2. Provide the author citation of C. maculatus 3. Generic epithet could be abbreviated after the first citation. 4. Not so. See the results. 5. Check and correct the author citation. 6. Express this in percentage values of the stored products. 7. Not clear . Rewrite. 8. Provide the units 9. Generally, negative control contains nothing. Treating with solvent results in positive control. 10. Indicate the source of these beetles. 11. Of what ????? 12. Not clear. Rewrite. 13. This is a positive control. A negative control should not contain solvent or plant extract. 14. Avoid repeating values that are already in the tables.	1. provided 2. provided 3. corrected as suggested 4. This conclusion is for the general one including treated and untreated bambara groundnut while in the result you highlighted is related only to the untreated bambara groundnut seeds. 5. checked and corrected 6. Expressed in % 7. Sentence rewritten 8. Units provided 9. Right, but in this case, we are testing the efficacy of plant extracts and not the solvent. As we use solvent to dissolve the extracts to prepare different concentrations, we should use the solvent as a negative control. Note that positive control is supposed to be a commercial insecticide acting as our extracts. 10. Source of beetles indicated 11. of pea beetles 12. Sentence rewritten 13. See comment 9 14. Corrected 15. corrected 16. Cited fully 17. It is standard error of mean (See table's caption) 18. It is standard error of mean 19. Error corrected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	15. See comments above. 16. Do not abbreviate, cite fully. 17. Is this standard deviation or standard error ???? 18. ?????? 19. What is this ?? 20. Delete 21. Instead of repeating the values in the tables try to present the increase in %. 22. See the abstract. 23. Change according to the journal format. 24. Is this the volume number or the issue number ?????	20. Deleted 21. Values presented in % 22. Here is the result of the control viz, untreated bambara groundnut seeds while the result in abstract includes treated and untreated bambara groundnut seeds. 23. Changed according to the journal format. 24. It is Volume number (Corrected).
<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	The presentation needs to be improved	Overall revision was made and the presentation was also improved.