



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/1704
Title of the Manuscript:	Screening Potentials Weed Species as Alternate Hosts of Insect Vectors of the Lethal Yellowing Disease (LYD) of Coconut Palms (<i>Cocos nucifera</i> L.) in Nigeria.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected'/ if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	The study is very routine and vaguely planned with very poor scientific competence.	Agreed and corrected
Specific comments:	The observations were taken on all plant hoppers and leaf hoppers instead of concentrating on specific species serving as vectors which makes the study as aimless	Agreed. Because of the high financial implication involved in identifying all the different species of plant hoppers and leaf hoppers implicated in this study, we were able to identify few species such as leafhoppers of <i>Cicadellidae</i> and planthoppers of <i>Flugorida</i> .
Title and abstract	1. Title Page 1 line screening potential instead of <u>screening potentials</u> 2. Abstract was poorly written	Agreed and corrected.
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	1. The sentences in introduction were very poorly written and repeated several times	Agreed and corrected.
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	The reference given as Aisagbonhi and Kolade (1994) where he reported the list of insects encountered he clearly said transmission studies should be carried out to confirm their vector status. However, in the present study it never clearly says which species atleast they studied instead it says plant hoppers/ leaf hoppers	Agreed and corrected
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	Sub standard	Agreed and corrected
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	Not sufficient data,	Agreed and corrected.
Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	nil	
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not	no meaningful conclusion was drawn	Agreed and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.5

be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)		
References		