



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_49682
Title of the Manuscript:	Field Survey of cassava susceptibility to termite infestation as influenced by time, scale and management strategy in selected Owerri Agricultural zones, Southeast Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Title: The title is too long. Usually titles with up to 15 words are used. Conclusive titles are more appealing to the reader.</p> <p>Abstract: Consider entering keywords for your study.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction addresses the issue well. It describes the situation of cassava and the problem to be faced. However, I suggest inserting at least one paragraph on similar studies that might support research and major advances in the field. The introduction needs to be updated. This topic should contain recent information.</p> <p>Material and Methods:</p> <p>The numbering of the topic "Material and methods" should be corrected to "2".</p> <p>Was the questionnaire used for the interview taken from any book, document or article? If yes, please refer to the author of the questionnaire in the method.</p> <p>I suggest adding the variables that were exploited in tables 1 through 9. The information that 30 groups of farmers per zone were interviewed is also not included in the method.</p> <p>Results and Discussion</p> <p>In this topic the word "DISCUSSION" is completely capitalized.</p> <p>The results are well described and faithful to the data of the tables.</p> <p>However, the discussion seemed to me to be in depth sometimes. Perhaps it would be important to discuss why termites prefer to attack the stems and why humid periods favor termite proliferation.</p> <p>Paragraph 10: "However, the mean age group of respondents were 50.17% (zone 1), 45.83% (zone 2), 59.00% (zone 3) and 53.43% (zone 4)." I did not understand how the average age was explained in%. I believe that stockings have been given in years.</p> <p>The most important here is perhaps to update the references cited. Some of them date back 30 years. Different climatic conditions, changes in cassava cultivation, seasonality of termite attack, the increase in the variety of termite species, make the very old references (30 years old) used are fragile to explain what occurred in the present study.</p> <p>Conclusion/Recommendation</p> <p>The conclusions seem to me well placed. Responding well to the objectives of the study. However, fragments of discussion are present in this topic. Be more direct in the conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>References:</p>	<p>The manuscript has been modified thoroughly</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Total citations: 21</p> <p>Citations before the year 2000: 18 (85%) Citations between 2001 and 2010: 3 (15%) Citations between 2011 and 2019: 0 (0%)</p> <p>Type of citation: Articles in journals or magazines: 4 Documents and books: 16 Web sites: 1</p> <p>I suggest a revision of references to meet the standards of the journal. The manuscript presents 85% of the citations published before the year 2000. Book references must contain the total number of pages. All references cited predate the year 2003. These are documents and articles with over 15 years of publication. I suggest an update of the references, especially in the introduction and discussion.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Perhaps the incompatibility between software, from the file I received, caused changes in the text's structure. However, they deserve to be reviewed throughout the article.</p> <p>If there were photos of the results achieved, it would leave the work richer in information.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The study is interesting. Although somewhat subjective, it presents important information for the local farming community and future researchers. The method used is satisfactory to achieve the main aim of the work. However, some corrections and suggestions should be made to make the article publishable. The results are concise and well described. I suggest an update of the references, especially in the introduction and discussion.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	