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	**Article**

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

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is of significant importance as it addresses a critical issue in field pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) cultivation—pod borer infestation, which severely impacts crop yield and quality. By evaluating 36 advanced field pea genotypes for resistance to two major pod borers, *Helicoverpa armigera* and *Etiella zinckenella*, the study identifies promising genotypes with minimal pod damage and higher yields. These findings are crucial for developing resistant or tolerant varieties, which can reduce reliance on chemical pesticides, lower production costs, and promote sustainable agricultural practices. The research contributes valuable insights to integrated pest management (IPM) strategies and supports efforts to enhance field pea productivity, particularly in regions where it is a vital *Rabi* pulse crop. Overall, this study has practical implications for breeders, farmers, and policymakers aiming to improve food security and crop resilience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Yes**	
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.	Here are six constructive comments to improve the quality and clarity of the paper: 1. **Abstract Clarity and Detail**: ○ The abstract provides a good overview but could benefit from more specific details about the methodology and key findings. For example, it should briefly mention the experimental design (e.g., randomized block design) and the statistical methods used for analysis. Additionally, the abstract should highlight the practical implications of the findings, such as how the resistant genotypes could be utilized in breeding programs.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	medium	
Optional/General comments	1. **Introduction Context**: ○ The introduction provides a good background on field pea and its importance, but it could be strengthened by including more recent references and data. For instance, the statistics on field pea production and productivity should be updated to reflect the most recent data available. Additionally, the introduction could briefly discuss the economic impact of pod borers on field pea production to emphasize the significance of the study. 2. **Methodology Detail**: ○ The methodology section is clear but lacks some details that would enhance reproducibility. For example, it should specify the exact dates of sowing and harvesting, the environmental conditions during the study period, and any specific criteria used for selecting the genotypes. Additionally, the section should provide more information on how the pest susceptibility rating (PSR) was calculated, including the formula used and any assumptions made. 3. **Results Presentation**: ○ The results section is comprehensive but could be improved by including more visual aids, such as graphs or charts, to illustrate the differences in pod damage and yield among the genotypes. This would make the data more accessible and easier to interpret. Additionally, the tables could be simplified by removing redundant information and focusing on key data points. 4. **Discussion Depth**: ○ The discussion section should delve deeper into the implications of the findings. For example, it could discuss how the resistant genotypes identified in the study could be integrated into existing breeding programs or pest management strategies. Additionally, the discussion should compare the findings with those of similar studies in greater detail, highlighting any novel insights or contradictions.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Amine Assouguem**
Department, University & Country	**Moulay Ismaïl University, Morocco**