



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2015_AJEA_17715
Title of the Manuscript:	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
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	The paper “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 “ studies a very interesting subject, yet according to my perspective a revision should be introduced. According to my knowledge, the abstract should avoid sentences like “very little literature on the impact of this fertilizer on the aggregation patterns of common but important insect pests of vegetables is available, necessitating this work”, as it is not relevant to the readers at that stage. Additionally, Although the aims is clear and objective, too much details about the methodology is introduced. Besides, the abstract must clearly report the main conclusions of the work, which are missing. Indeed, the abstract mostly reports only results without any general conclusion. The Materials and Methods are clearly stated, yet must specifically report the study site and location by introducing the GPS coordinates. As the authors conduct An “initial soil test was done to ascertain the soil’s nutrient	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	status”, the data must be introduced so that readers can relate data with the treatments of the experimental design. The Results Section does not have any statistical treatment in Figs 1-4 and, therefore it is not possible to understand if the trends are significant or not. A Two way ANOVA is required to understand the behavior among treatments and during the time course. That it would allow a more consistent interpretation of data. The Discussion Section is too much poor. A clear hypothesis to explain the author’s data is missing. The discussion is essentially a general repetition of data linked to a few other authors’ works. Discussion should be improved. Considering all the data presented a short conclusion should also be included, so that the readers could focus in the main ideas of the work. I major problem of the work is also the English style that should be strongly improved.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fernando José Cebola Lidon
Department, University & Country	Earth Sciences Department, Faculty of Sciences and Technology, New University of Lisbon, Portugal