

RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Reviewer 1:

1. The title has been modified as suggested by reviewer 3.
2. The revised version has taken care of the wordiness of the manuscript.
3. The methodology of investigation has been confirmed for its adequacy.
4. The disparities between tables and write-up have been adjusted. This is as a result of typographical error.
5. The tables are okay as presented. No need of merging, otherwise they will not capture the findings adequately.
6. The units of measurements and legends have been appropriately effected.
7. Discussions, conclusions and recommendation have been properly revised to capture the findings of the investigation.
8. References have been revised following the stipulated guidelines.

Reviewer 2:

1. The active ingredient of the cypermethrin used is stated in the work.
2. The scientific names of the insect pest have been confirmed okay by entomologist.
3. Line 54 has been properly referenced.
4. Suggested lines for merger and editing have been done.
5. The correct dimension of the plot in line 132 has been affected.
6. All the cited references have been listed while the listed have been cited.
7. The control experiment is stated in the treatment combinations.
8. The general grammatical and scientific errors have been properly addressed.

Reviewer 3:

1. The title has been restructured as suggested.
2. All necessary words merging and editing have done.
3. Statements made have been properly referenced.
4. N.P.K. 15-15-15 in line 76 is in order.
5. Proper plot dimension in line 132 has been stated.
6. In line 134, leaf part was used as required.
7. Specific weights of leaves in line 141 are as stated.
8. The pH and CEC data have been corrected to conform to the data mentioned in table 1.
9. In line 160 the data have been corrected appropriately.
10. Lines 220 and 221 have been adequately addressed.
11. Line 249 has been referenced.
12. The revised conclusions now reflected the major findings.
13. The pH data have been corrected, while the textural classes have been provided.
14. The alphabets in the DMRT have been properly adjusted for better understandings.
15. Legends and units of measurements have adequately addressed.

In conclusion I sincerely appreciate the constructive critics of this manuscript because it improves the quality of the work.

I appreciate your timely review of the work and time to time reminder memo. Its nice working with you.

Thank you.

Dr. Bola Senjobi.