

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118388
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of carrot root borer, <i>Melanagromyza</i> sp. in carrot <i>Dacus carota</i> L.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript is interesting and useful. Effective new methods and materials of plant pest control are important for agricultural plant growers and researchers.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, except that the data is repeated in Table 1 and Figure 1. 'MEAN' and 'ROC (%)' should be removed from Table 1, as these indicators are shown in Figure 1.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Five plants were selected randomly and percent infestation was calculated. The sample size is too small for the results to be representative of the full range of carrots. At least thirty plants should be assessed. The carrot infestation data (Table 1) were transformed. Why? An explanation is needed.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I'm not a very good language expert.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The work merits publication, but duplication of data should be avoided.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rita Čepulienė
Department, University & Country	Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania