

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_126676
Title of the Manuscript:	Survey and monitoring of thrips ( <i>Thrips tabaci</i> ) Lindeman in onion crop
Type of the Article	Scientific/academic

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The study is relevant dealing with a crop that is used on a daily basis as a spice but its production is constrained by several biotic factors. Apart from diseases, thrips causes high losses on the crop. The authors have endeavoured to show this. The manuscript is addressing a real problem in the farmers' fields unfortunately the gap that was being addressed has not been brought out clearly</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Include where the work was done (geographical area)</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Does not follow the standards guidelines IMRAD. Too short and has left some essentials out. It is missing key statements of how the survey was carried out in the field. How does 45% damage during Kharif compare with 65% during Rabi statistically? Any implications of the results? It shows no clear objective. Any comparison between the two seasons or experiments with this regard?</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes. But the following should be addressed</p> <p>Introduction: The authors have endeavoured to bring out the importance of onions and thrips but the research gap is not clear that made this survey to be undertaken. What was the problem and why the survey?</p> <p>Materials and Methods: They are poorly described. It would be difficult for one to replicate the methods and generate such kind of results. It is also too short, needs to be described in detail for someone to repeat and get similar results.</p> <p>Criteria for selecting 5 Villages? What number of households or fields were expected? Were the farmers asked any questions? If so how many and what was the criteria for their selection. Any specific survey tool used? Any farmers' practices observed? Was the incidence of infestation done in the fields? How were the 10 plants selected and on what area of the field (transect, W shape etc) from how many rows? How big were the fields? Were 10 plants a representative sample? How was the sampling done within the field? Were the populations estimated on the plants? How was the pest identified? Show in a table the differences of some common species of thrips to have concluded this is the species in the area.</p> <p>Results and discussion The results are poorly presented and they have not been explained except on few instances Severally method statements have been used here How did the fields compare within the season and out of season? Any populations estimated? Any other information collected in terms of farmers practices to explain the results? No comparison with other studies elsewhere about the pest has been done</p> <p>Conclusions Neither here or there because it is not clear what the authors set out to do Clarify the objective, conclude with reference to the objective. Objective gives guidance on which research questions to ask and answer in the study? in the conclusion, there is information included that Has not been reported in the results. The recommendations bring out a lot of suggestions which were not assessed in the survey or rather reported in this paper to conclude that they need to be enhanced or introduced all together.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The authors have an idea of the materials and methods but they need to describe and demonstrate the external validity of the study. If the comments raised above are answered and included in the manuscript the two will well be addressed</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> -</p>	<p>Some citations are not done correctly. Identify one reference style, stick to the way the citations are done and in the listing of the references. Some consistency is needed. They are rather old knowing that this is a pest scientists and the agrochemical industry are dealing with very so often because of the change in climate. Recent literature even if 'grey' can be included.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Revision is required where possible somebody who knows English can edit the manuscript</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>General observations</b> Language Spelling mistakes Incorrect citations (consistency) follow one referencing system and adhere to it The study is relent and carries good information but is presented either as a case study or short communication but does not quite fit the criteria Probably a lot of assumption was made, let the authors communicate even to the laymen with little or no knowledge about thrips  <b>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</b></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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Dora C. Kilalo</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>College of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences, University of Nairobi, Kenya</b></p>