



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_38712
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of cowpea (Vigna unguiculata L.) genotypes' growth and yield performance and resistance to the cowpea seed beetle, <i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i> F
Type of the 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>)

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	More details in the section materials and methods	More details have been included in the Materials and Methods, especially on data collection on oviposition, adult mortality, development period and F ₁ progeny emergence.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	the author should add another experiment to test the variety most preferred by the insect for the laying, it is put in the presence of the different varieties author must perfect the language in the results and discussion section	Data from that experiment would not vary from that contained in this Paper. But we will consider evaluating other genotypes and later publish the results in another Paper. The language is OK as far as we are concerned, and we would have considered to do what the reviewer expected if he/she had indicated specific statements to improve.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	the work is very interesting and encouraging only the author should test the variety preferred by the insect and the variety not preferred together and not each apart the conclusion is poor	These comments have been taken care of, in the responses above. The conclusion appears concise and OK.