

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_89257
Title of the Manuscript:	Insect pests and their direct damage of Piliostigma reticulatum (D.C.) Hochst flowers and pods in north-soudanian region of Burkina Faso
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:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The paper is a good contribution to a different research context in Burkina Faso. The empirical setting is very interesting because there are not so many publications on this application in this context, and it has a lot of interesting information. The research design is well developed, as much as the research gap. In addition, please, find some comments to be addressed in this paper. Thus, the abstract should avoid sentences regarding the assumption that the reader knows where the experiment is taking place. Besides, the authors should pay attention to the study design description. In the introduction, the authors should avoid long texts with no paragraphs in terms of content and structure. Also, at the end of the introduction, the aim of the research should be the general one. Besides, this lack of definition is also on the conclusion chapter. The conclusion can only be developed when the Introduction is well developed and there must be a connection with it. Finally, there are several issues concerning the sentence structure and grammatical errors of the English throughout the document and I would suggest proper proofreading before resubmitting.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

### PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Flavio Andrew do Nascimento Santos
Department, University & Country	Berlin School of Business and Innovation, Germany