

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_119052</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Morphological characterization of Callosobruchus maculatus and C. chinensis and seed damage assessment in monogamous and polygamous condition in mung bean</b>
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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript informs about pests on green bean plants but does not provide a solution to the problem</p> <p>2. The title of the article is in accordance with the contents</p> <p>3. The abstract article is it need research objectives to be</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript still needs additions and The script needs to be completed</p> <p>5. The script is correct but needs to be completed again</p> <p>6.. Refrence i enough so it not needs to be adde</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality of the writing is quite good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This article still needs improvement if it is published in a journal and need to check again the similarity of theoretical sources and references</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><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anang Susanto
Department, University & Country	Merdeka University, Indonesia