



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2013_AJEA_8109
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative efficacies of phytopesticide in the management of Podagrica spp and mosaic disease on okra (Abelmoschus esculentus L.)
Type of the Article	Full length Research Paper

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	Author should indicate whether data was taken in the minor or major rainy season (in 2012), because <i>Podagrica</i> spp populations are known to be reduced drastically during (heavy) rainfalls (No. 67) What quantity of the 'soap' solution was added to the plant extracts? Could the 'soap' added to each of the prepared plant extract to serve as an additive or adhesive have any significant effect on the action or activity the plant extracts? The treatments were 10% (w/v) crude extracts; Could the results have changed at a higher quantity or rate of crude extract of each phytopesticide (say 15% (w/v) or 20% (w/v)? Was there any significant effect of the plant extracts on the other important pests of okra identified e.g. Leaf hoppers, cotton strainers and whitefly? Did Author consider severity with respect to the type or variety of okra used for the study? NB: other okra varieties could attract higher or even lower <i>Podagrica</i> spp populations.....	Data was taken in the major rainy season. Correction is highlighted in the text. Ten millilitres of soap was added to each extract. The soap only served as an adhesive without any significant effect on the activity of the plant extract. Yes, generally for most plant extracts the higher the concentration the higher their pesticide properties. However, 10% is what most researchers use as a standard. Yes, the extracts significantly reduced the population of cotton strainers and whitefly. The effect of leafhoppers was however not recorded. These insect pests were not the main focus of our study. The okra variety used in the study was "Asontem". It is the most popular variety in Ghana, and is highly susceptible to the <i>Podagrica</i> spp and the mosaic virus disease they vector. We did not evaluate the



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Incidence of okra mosaic disease (DI), based on visual symptoms (No. 142): A more scientific standard of measurement was required instead of Just VISUAL symptoms identification. (Nos. 264, 285) Author should remain consistent in quoting, ($P > 0.05$) or ($P > .05$), ($P = .01$) (No.326). Author should follow referencing style of AJEA Ackah <i>et al.</i> (2013).... (No. 368); should change 'workers' to 'researchers'	effect of other okra type or variety. The mosaic symptom is characteristic of the okra mosaic disease infection; hence visual symptoms identification is a reliable measure to study its incidence. We are aware of other detection methods such as ELISA or polymerase chain reaction but there was no need to use any of them in this study. AJEA's preferred format i.e. $P < .05$ or $P < .01$ has now been used. Please see manuscript. AJEA Referencing Style has now been strictly followed. Ackah <i>et al.</i> (2013) has been changed to Ackahl <i>et al.</i> (2013). It is now numbered [31] in the manuscript. "Workers" have been changed to "researchers" in the manuscript. These have been highlighted.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Author should Provide details of the levels of the ACTIVE INGREDIENTS in EACH of the plant extract (phytopesticide) used in the current study (eg. Azadirachtin, Allicin, Capsaicin and Papain)	Since crude extracts were used, the level of active ingredients in each of the plant extract used is not necessary. Besides, the active ingredient in extracts such as mahogany is not available in the literature.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The Research article is a good one and must be encouraged, especially as it seeks to promote an alternative means of protection and conservation of the environment.	Thanks for the compliments.