

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Experimental Agriculture International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JEAI_126894 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Efficacy of Novel Insecticides Against Leucinodes orbonalis in Brinjal Cultivation |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION 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> |
|---|---|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>It is important because it addresses a serious pest of brinjal, and the method used is novel in the sense that it does not dwell on old poisonous pesticides for pest control. The writing is also brief and readable.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>OK</p> <p>Issue: Chlorpyriphos and Bifenthrin may not be novel insecticides. How available and affordable are these products?</p> | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The MM section</p> | |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>It is sound in a way that it has tested a range of novel pesticides and generated data for them. Yet there are issues to be taken care of.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We report number of insects per unit, which will let one see advantages of good pesticides. You chose reduction percentage instead, which cannot show you the actual number of pests per experimental unit. As I saw it, infestation has never been more than 30% during the entire study period. Is that true? 2. On Introduction: Brinjal production statistics might offer an advantage (one sentence or two). What rank does it have in your study area compared to other vegetables. Better add scientific name. For the international reader, using eggplant as additional name might be beneficial. 3. Materials and Methods: What plot size was it tested? It cannot be individual plants in pots because its is RCBD. Field layout must be described (plot size, spacings between plots, blocks and alleys). Please define incidence in the MM. Was it the number of plants found infested, fruits, or what? Also, difference between infestation and incidence because you have different data for these two (see your conclusion part). What growth stage were 1st and 2nd spray done? Time gap between the two. Please state in the MM. What was this reduction from? What were they from which that reduction was calculated? 4. Results and Discussion: Table 1 - PTP? Please define. It seems that data were collected three times at 3-day intervals, introducing time as an additional factor in your analysis. It would be beneficial to consider a repeated measures analysis to determine whether time significantly influences the mortality of the pest. This approach could help demonstrate whether the number of borers killed increases over time. If time is indeed a crucial factor, presenting this information in a graph rather than a table would enhance clarity and visualization of the trends. <p>This concept of reduction.</p> <p>Does this indicate that you introduced the borers artificially to assess how their numbers decreased over time? If so, this process should be clearly described in the Materials and Methods section. Conversely, if your study focused on naturally occurring borers, it's essential to include an initial count prior to spraying, as well as counts after the treatment, to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impact.</p> | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>Most are old. Should have been 5 years old or if unavoidable 10 years. So most are not good for the current state of pesticide issue. Plus, some five of the references are not found in the text or are wrongly listed in the reference section.</p> | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Major revision. The English is OK.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | <p>Consider revising the MM (field lay out with its dimensions is lacking), data analysis be repeated measures, and better use pest count directly, which shows the actual pests density, rather than reduction.</p> <p>The field layout should be added because the reader is left in the dark how it was done in the field (whether it was a pot experiment or field experiment). Data analysis better be repeated measures. References should be revised (many are older than 5 years and many are not found in the body or are listed incorrectly like with a wrong author list or publication year)</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Melaku Wale</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia</p> |