

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_121221
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological basis of resistance in pigeonpea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i> (L.) Millsp.) against pod borer complex
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Investigating the morphological basis of resistance in pigeonpea against pod borers is crucial for developing sustainable and effective crop management strategies. This research can help identify key morphological traits associated with resistance, enabling breeders to develop pigeonpea varieties with enhanced resistance to pod borers. Additionally, understanding the relationship between morphological characters and pod borer resistance can inform integrated pest management approaches, promoting eco-friendly and resilient agricultural practices.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>I will suggest the title 'Evaluation of Pigeonpea (<i>Cajanus cajan</i> (L.) Millsp.) Cultivars for Pod Borer Resistance: A study on Morphological Traits and Larval Population Dynamics'</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>Yes, but few highlighted observations should be corrected The introductory section needs minor changes as highlighted in the manuscript. [first and second paragraph].</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Section 2 'Materials and method' needs total revamp. I suggest the presentation to be: 2 Materials and method 2.1 Sample collection and preparation 2.2 Determination of pod size 2.3 Determination of pod wall thickness 2.4 Determination of seed number per pod 2.5 Determination of seed density 2.6 Determination of trichome length and density of pod [The references to these methods were lacking, please add valid references]</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript seems to be more of results presentation with very few discussions, I will suggest a total revamp of the results and discussion with more valid references to correlate findings, it is the only way to ascertain for its validity. The results or table presentations could come first as per 'results and discussion', or preferably, each discussion should have a table/result to compliment the observations or discussions, with more valid references to compare findings.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are too old, 1983 [2], 1998 [5], 2001 [6], 1996 [10], 1995 [11], 2006 [12] and need to be updated, unfortunately, this manuscript lack literatures.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are rooms for improvement, I have highlighted some comments that needs to be addressed.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 3

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:	Kalu Michael Kalu
Department, University & Country	Gombe State University, Nigeria