



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_14685
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical and Pesticides uses status in the Chalan beel, Bangladesh and its impact on fish Biodiversity
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	I strongly recommend an English review of the entire manuscript. Check for spelling and grammar errors.	Thank you very much for your comment. We have reviewed and modified the manuscript wherever necessary.
	Lines 58 – 62 are repeated in results lines 156 – 159. I suggest review and change one of them.	We have checked and changed the lines (Line 58-60 and lines 165-166).
	Line 25: check the area value in parenthesis. It seems the number is incomplete.	Sorry, it would be 114161 ha.
	Lines 68 e 70: Rewrite the objectives of the study. The English is confusing, mainly in the “Also the causes of its degradation in relation to the environmental parameters in the Chalan beel located in the North West Bangladesh” “Also” what?	We rewrite the objectives as “The study was conducted to investigate the present status of pesticide usages and its effects on fish biodiversity of Chalan beel”.
	Line 101: This study did not sample fish or pesticide in water, so it was not a survey field method. The information was obtained by questionnaire. Therefore, I strongly recommend change “field survey” to “questionnaire survey”.	We have replaced the term “field survey” to “questionnaire survey” accordingly.
	Lines 103-104: “The survey method was chosen for the study because it was thought to be more advantageous and helpful to know the present status of pesticide and other chemicals in the Chalan beel.” The present status of pesticides could be obtained directly by field survey, measuring water quality. I think the authors could explain better why the “questionnaire survey” was chosen instead of “field survey”. What are the advantages of this methodology?	We deleted the confusing lines.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 115 – 118: The authors should give a sample of the questionnaire that was used to precede the study. If possible the entire questionnaire should be published as an appendix or supplementary material. I think this would be good not only to make the manuscript more robust but also could help readers to replicate this methodology.	Ok, we use the questionnaire as supplementary material.
	Line 123-125: the statistical methods are described, but the results of the tests are not presented in the results. At least it is not clear what are the statistical differences detected in the results, because the statistical values of p is not presented.	We replaced one paragraph in the item Data processing and analysis as “The data were generated and subjected to..... program”.
	Information and data regarding fish mortality (Lines 197 – 212) should be presented in the topic “Impacts on fish biodiversity”	We replaced the data in the topic “Impacts on fish biodiversity” accordingly.
	Results: I suggest change the order of presenting the results so we can see logic of effects (Chalan Beel agriculture and physical aspects> Pesticides> pesticides in Chalan Beel> Farms knowledge on pesticide usage> fish impacts (mortality and production). So first it would be better present and characterize the Dynamic of cropping practice together with physical characteristics of Chalan beel (lines 181-196 + lines 130-132 + Table 2). This way you introduce data about your study area and the agricultural practice. Second, you should present the chemical use status (lines 134-167). Third the scenario of pesticide use in Chalan beel (lines 214-245). Fourth the farmers’ knowledge on pesticide usage (lines 169-180) Fifth the Impacts on fish biodiversity (lines 250-278 + 197-205). If I understood correctly the idea of the paper, this topic will be more completely showing the pesticide impact not only on fish productivity, but also on fish mortality.	We rearranged the result and Discussions accordingly.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 163: "...in full swing". What does it mean?	Deleted the confusing word.
	Line 167: cite reference for "now do not breed"	Added reference.
	Line 173: "The insufficient information (...)". Actually it would be better just say "The information they received (...)".	Deleted the word "insufficient".
	Line 261-268: how the recruitment of fish was measured? If this was not measured in this study, the authors should cite a reference.	Cited reference [5].
	Line 268-270: ...reference?	Cited reference.
	Line 282-283: "...catches in Chalan beel legally and..." no data regarding catches was presented. How the conclusions bring such information without present it?	Deleted the confusing line.
	Table 3: Too much information in this table, making it difficult to visualize data and understand the variation of pesticide usage. I suggest substituting the table for a graph. The graph could show the mean total for each pesticide. Could be a graph for 2008 and another one for 2009. It the year it's not important the mean could include not only the upazillas but also the years.	We agree to this point of shifting Table 3 to graph, if the editor also agree.
	Table 4: The farmer's perception are described for several items, but it is not clear what "on birds; on human health, on agro-bio diversity, on soil fertility" means. Readers can think that is the perception that affects all those things, but the way it is presented should be more direct and clear.	Ok, we added on paragraph as "Around 8% farmers soil fertility (Table 7)."
Minor REVISION comments	Table 8: the legend is not corresponding to the data in the table (2000 – 2009) "Group wise pesticide consumption for the year 2002-2009". I suggest ordinate the years in the table from 2000 – 2009.	Sorry for mistake and we made correction.
	Review legends punctuation.	Reviewed legends punctuation.
	Review results items numbers.	We made correction
	Review abstract after all corrections.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The issue seems to be very relevant for the study area. So it is an important manuscript that documents the pesticide impact on fish in Bangladesh. I strongly recommend an English review and a change in the structure of the results to ordinate the information in a cause-effect sequence.	Again thanks. We reviewed and changed according to your suggestions.
---	--	--