



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	2014_AJEA_15609
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative performance of Pyrethrum (<i>Chrysanthemum cinerariifolium</i> Treviranus) extract and Cypermethrin on some field insect pests of groundnut (<i>Arachis hypogea</i> . L.) in southeastern Nigeria.
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	Put a full stop after "...spray regime" in line 126. Make it clear if/how "pod and seed development stages" relates with "...4, 6, 8 WAP". One would think that the insect data before the spray was meant to be a covariate to reduce the experimental error in the results. A comment on this is lacking in the data analysis. In line 158 the author is fitting the data in to a model and not subjecting..... Data analysis part is too brief, needs to elaborate on the fitting of different sets of data the author has, to model(s). The figures 0.14 and 0.06 in line 299, do not seem to be agreeing with the corresponding ones in Table 4.	Putting full stop after "... spray regime" would not be appropriate, please. We have made clear the pod and seed development stages in relation to 4, 6 and 8 WAP as advised. The data were collated to know the exact pests in-order to avoid distortion of pest types after the spray regimes had started. The figures in the tables are NOT the same and so cannot have the same LSD or significance levels. Tables 2 and 4 are FULLY dedicated to interaction analysis. There is no need, therefore, to bring the same data into tables 1 and 3. That would amount to undue repetition.
Minor REVISION comments	Correct Line 21-"sub-Saharan Arica" to "sub-Saharan Africa" Line 85- "pistil" author meant "pestle" Line 93: Subtitle not necessary, The author can have a paragraph starting as "Viability test was done..." and at the end of the paragraph state why it had to be done Line 100: 2.3 Land Preparation and Planting, as subtitle, . And have paragraphs thereafter, without subtitles. Line 112: It is not clear how a plot 1 X 1m and spacing of 30cm X 15cm would have 22 plants, not even when one considers guard row material	Corrected. Corrected. Authors elected to retain subtitles, please.. Other adjustments have been made. The calculation is clear and very accurate: Plot = 1 m x 1 m, ie. 100 cm x 100 cm = 10,000 cm². Spacing = 30 cm x 15 cm = 450 cm² Plant population = 10,000/450 = 22.22 plants. Approximated to 22 plants/plot.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 117: to read "Treatments and Data Collection" all subtitles can be removed to have paragraphs only. Additional sentence in the conclusion "Raising varieties and clones, for the purpose, with high py-content should be looked into, as the potency is dependent on the content."	Authors elected to retain the subtitles, please. Thank you for this very important suggestion. The sentence has been added.