

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_119238
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of medium maturity group of pigeonpea germplasm against pod borer complex.
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:

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

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> This manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it evaluates different pigeonpea genotypes against the pod borer complex. Given the importance of pigeonpea as a major legume crop for human nutrition and its role in enhancing soil fertility, identifying and introducing genotypes resistant to pests can greatly improve yield and reduce economic losses due to pest infestations. The findings of this study provide valuable insights for researchers and farmers in selecting resistant genotypes and optimizing agricultural practices, thereby contributing to more efficient and sustainable agricultural production. The current title of the article, is suitable as it clearly conveys the focus of the study on evaluating pigeonpea genotypes for resistance against pod borer pests. However, it could be made more concise and impactful. Alternative Title: "Evaluation of Medium Maturity Pigeonpea Genotypes for Resistance to Pod Borer Complex" The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive as it provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. It effectively highlights the significance of the research and summarizes the main results, such as the identification of resistant and susceptible pigeonpea genotypes and their respective pod damage percentages and grain yields. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for a scientific study. Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears to follow scientific methods correctly and presents data in a systematic manner. The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant, covering a broad range of studies related to pigeonpea, pest management, and statistical methods used in agricultural research. But for further study, the following sources are suggested. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Sharma, H. C., Stevenson, P. C., & Gowda, C. L. L. (2005). Helicoverpa management: Emerging trends and strategies for future research. Oxford and IBH Publishers. □ Singh, M. K., Keval, R., Chakravarty, S., & Mishra, V. K. (2017). Screening of Pigeonpea Genotypes against Tur Pod Fly Melanagromyza obtuse (Malloch) in Agro Ecosystem. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 6(3), 1911-1917. □ Sinha, S., Singh, V., Bhagat, M., & Patel, M. (2022). Screening of germplasm of medium maturity group of pigeonpea against pod borer complex. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the provided excerpts, the language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications. The text is clear, structured, and adheres to the conventions of academic writing 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is a well-conducted study that addresses a relevant issue in agricultural science. With minor revisions to improve clarity, update references, and refine the presentation, it can make a significant contribution to the field. The findings have practical implications for improving pigeonpea cultivation and pest management strategies, which are valuable for researchers, farmers, and policymakers.</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:	Reza Rahmatollahi
Department, University & Country	Atatürk University, Türkiye