

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_96695
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of cowpea F2 population for resistance to flower bud thrips (megalurothrips sjostedti)
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, this investigation tackled an interesting point and can contribute to resolve the problem of thrips attacks on cowpea in Ghana with an inoffensive way to environment as well as human health. The work is an inspiring one for researcher in domain of plant resistance to insects and could be very helpful for scientists mostly interested in cowpea genotypes resistance to thrips precisely in African countries where it is a main grain-legume. Yes the title is suitable</p> <p>Generally the abstract is comprehensive unless in the last three lines there is some expressions that must be reformulated</p> <p>Yes they are appropriate</p> <p>Yes, but there are some information needed in the subsection Material and methods to be added to clarify the research.</p> <p>Well the references are sufficient and mostly recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>In general the English language is comprehensible but there are some parts to be reformulated (especially the Recommendation subsection. Also some sentences in the Abstract, repetition of the verb advance which must be avoid...Look for the correction on the manuscript)</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bengouga Khalila
Department, University & Country	Algeria