

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_121082
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity and Synergistic Effect of Native Plants Extracts Against the Cowpea Weevil (<i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i> Fab.) (Coleoptera: Bruchidae)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
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.	This work is interesting and can be applied for preserving the precious (at least in a city of Africa) food, cowpea seeds. Actually, it is not a novel finding but the results supported the previous works. To make it clearer, the authors should add the reasons of choosing these 3 plant extracts for this study in the Introduction. Why were they? Additionally, the life cycle of <i>Callosobruchus maculatus</i> should be given. How is its average life span? Why were the 8 days (in the abstract) and 15 days (in the Toxicity test) selected? How did the LD 90 come from? From the Discussion, the results of this work just confirmed what were previously reported. The authors should discuss the cost-benefit of using these plant extracts for protecting the seeds. Are these plants available widely in that area?	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. The word "Toxicity" has the sense of harm to human. But in this work it represents the harm to undesired insect. The title should be "Insecticidal Effect of Native Plants Extracts Against the Cowpea Weevil"	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	The study was well designed. However, the number of insects per each experiment is quite small for accurate results. And some observed and calculated parameters as LD90 and how seeds were identified as damage were not clarified.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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

[Review Form 3](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Veeravan Lekskulchai
Department, University & Country	Srinakharinwirot University, Thailand