



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_22115
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of Plant Density and Planting Dates on the Population of Major Podsucking bugs in Relation to Damage and Yield of Improved Pigeonpea Cultivar in Owerri Rainforest Zone, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original research Articles

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	A very well written paper with good discussion but there are certain queries and suggestions in the methods and result section which need to be looked into. The paper can be accepted for publication after major revision.	Introduction: In page 1 line 55, the word 'in' has been removed Materials and Methods: In line 81 of the pdf format 'in the ' has been added to the sentence . In line 93 and 106 in the Pdf, you did not indicate an action to be taken. I am of the opinion that the sentences are correct and had conveyed the needed information. Results: I cannot understand what is wrong with the table, Is the caption wrong? Indicate an action please. Figure 1 (a) and (b) R. dentipes italicized.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		Discussion: In line 325, I hope ‘at enough quantity’ is appropriate in comparative terms. In lines,341, 350 and 352 names of insects have been italized. Line 401 one ‘observed’ removed
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	These are marked in the text	Line 433 double full stop removed. My comments: I thank the reviewer for all his observations which I have taken into account. However, there was no action on some of his comments because I believe the information given were justifiable enough to be allowed. However let me know the action/s to be taken, should there be counter opinion on those areas.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		