

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_130518
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening of Advanced Field Pea (Pisum sativum L.) Genotypes against Pod Borers
Type of the Article	Peer-review

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: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The screening of advanced field pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) genotypes against pod borers holds significant importance for the scientific community as it contributes to sustainable agricultural practices and food security. Pod borers, such as <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> , is one of the major insect pests that can cause substantial yield losses in legumes, necessitating for the development of resistant cultivars. By identifying resistant genotypes against pod borers, this work aids in reducing dependency on continuous application of chemicals, thereby promoting eco-friendly pest management strategies. In addition, it enhances our understanding of pest-host interactions and facilitates the breeding of resilient varieties, which is very crucial for improving productivity and ensuring the profitability in the face of insect pest challenges.	Agreed
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Since there are many pod borers infesting <i>Pisum sativum</i> only two are studied. Hence the title can be Screening of Advanced Field Pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) Genotypes for resistance against two Pod Borers.	Agreed to modify the title as mentioned below : Screening of Advanced Field Pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) Genotypes for resistance against <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> and <i>Etiella zinckenella</i>
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive	Agreed
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct	Agreed
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	Agreed
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	Yes Agreed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Screening of Advanced Field Pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) Genotypes against Pod Borers" is clear, concise and communicates the work effectively. Much more work has to be done on different pod borers such as <i>Melanagromyza obtusa</i> , <i>Maruca vitrata</i> , <i>Adisura atkinsoni</i> and <i>Exelastis atomosa</i> etc as they can causes losses range from 10% to 90% depending on the conditions and the density of the infestation.	Yes. Presently this study was focussed only on these two pod borer. In future the suggestion of the reviewer will be taken into the consideration.

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?	<u><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></u>	No