



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_12196
Title of the Manuscript:	Uses of jellyfish in pre sowing seeds treatment and pest control
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	This study deals with the use of jellyfish in pre sowing seeds treatment and pest control against two insects of economic importance: <i>Oryzaephilus surinamensis</i> and <i>Bactrocera zonata</i>. While the topic is already covered by numerous previous works, it seems that there is a specific novelty here: data is about a particular the insecticidal potential of digested solution of jellyfish on a stored product pest the <i>O. surinamensis</i>. Therefore, I am recommending acceptance after taking into account the following comments: 1. One general comment is that the language needs attention. There are several parts on which English should be further corrected (my suggestion here for the authors is to send the text to a colleague whose English is his mother tongue). 2. In the Introduction Section, no citations about the bio-insecticide potential of the jellyfish. A brief review on insecticidal effects of the jellyfish on different insect species will be very useful in introducing your work. I recommend adding a paragraph in this respect like the first one dealing with plants (Line37-Line56). 3. The choice of insects should be argued because really I could not make out the relationship concerning the management strategies of both the peach fruit fly <i>B. zonata</i> , a pest of fruit crops, and the sawtoothed grain beetle <i>O. surinamensis</i>, a stored product pest. 4. Materials and Methods Section: *Date, locality and season of Jellyfish collection should be added *The rearing artificial diet or feeding substance for <i>O. surinamensis</i> should	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	be indicated. Moreover, the age of adults used for the experiment should be précised (precise what do you mean by ‘The newly emerged adults were used in this study, Lines 112-113. *Line 120 better to say method of Finney [24] Results and Discussion Section The first sentence of paragraph 3.1 could be omitted because it is a repetition (Line 128-129). The paragraph can start with: It was noticed... Line 239: reached 96.67% and not reached to 96.67%. Lines 243-244: to reconsider because we cannot compare the susceptibility of different developmental stages of different insect species. You are not allowed to do such comparison. Line 246: It is wrong to say: ‘difference in the nature of the two pests’ please omit this sentence Table 6: For the LC50 values, please dive the lower and upper confidence limits, Slope $\pm$ SEM, Degree of freedom and χ^2 values since they are provide by the Probit analysis (finney, 1971).	
Minor REVISION comments	The Results flow is OK, but at some points, there are some repetitions on what is mentioned in the Tables	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jouda Mediouni Ben Jemâa
Department, University & Country	National Agricultural Research Institute of Tunisia (INRAT), Tunis, Tunisia