

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116702
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlation between rice weevil infestation <i>Sitophilus oryzae</i> (Linnaeus) and seed quality parameters of maize (<i>Zea mays</i>. L) seed
Type of the Article	Review 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> <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>Manuscripts play a crucial role in advancing scientific knowledge and benefit the scientific community in several ways. They serve as bridges connecting researchers, institutions, and the broader scientific community</p> <p>It effectively conveys the main elements of the study. So the title is suitable</p> <p>The abstract provides a solid overview, but consider refining the purpose, elaborating on methods and findings, and emphasizing the discipline's contribution</p> <p>The manuscript follows the IMRaD i.e. (introduction, methodology, results and discussion) format, which is the standard for scientific articles. Well-structured and informative, it contributes valuable insights to the scientific community</p> <p>From what is presented here, the manuscript appears to follow a standard structure for scientific research papers (introduction, methodology, observation etc)</p> <p>Yes, The reference provided contribute to the scientific knowledge base and can guide further research and practical applications</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality seem suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yusuf Hajara Oyiza
Department, University & Country	Nigeria