



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                                                                                                                 |
| Manuscript Number:       | 2015_AJEA_17715                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Impact of Different Levels of Nitrogen in Liquid Fertilizer (Sidalco) on the Population Dynamics and Within Plant Distribution of <i>Aphis gossypii</i> and <i>Thrips palmi</i> and Yield of Eggplant</b> |
| 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**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | Comments - please refer to the manuscript. To my opinion, the aspect of study is OK but the collected data is inadequate to publish as full article. I noticed the number of collected <i>Aphis gossypii</i> and <i>Thrips palmi</i> is quite low in order to show the impact. So, I suggest the author/s to add more data (i.e. lengthen the study duration). | I do not think you need to have large numbers of insects before one can publish results of an experiment. A study is undertaken to produce results, so whatever data that is produced from the results can be published because that is information too. In the present study, statistical differences were obtained in some of the data, and this is worth publishing. |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |