



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_45607
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of the application of Sulphur formulation on the abundance and activity of insect predators naturally existing in Marrow fields
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	Line 44: mention specific distance instead of "far enough" Lines 91& 92; 140 & 141: $p = 5\%$ should be alpha value i.e. $\alpha = 5\%$ or 0.05 and not p . P has its variable values for multiple entries at a constant alpha (probability or confident limit value rated in percentage). Table 2 shows 102.27 for untreated plot under percentage increase. Why is this only value greater than 100 %? Graph plot 145: the vertical axis title should read- % of increase/decrease in population. Line 153: 'who found' should be used for "whom found". Line 189: delete 'the'. Line 190: add 'were' before kept.	- Line 44: the distance between treated/untreated plots and untreated plots in the 2nd area was 350 meters. - Lines 91& 92; 140 & 141: (α) symbol used for F-values whether it was performed at 5% or 1% permissible error, but P-value used for the probability of repetition of an action through 100 times; then when I wrote $P=5\%$ it indicated that F-test was performed at $\alpha = 5\%$. Then I think that no need to carryout any changes. - Table 2: The value 102.27%, was the result of calculated percentages of increase/decrease according to the prevailing adults. This was referred to the escaping of the enormous number of adults after sulphur application. - Graph plot 145: The (%) symbol is already written as (Percentage of) and I recorded only the adults fluctuation but not the whole population. - Line 153: Corrected. - Line 189: Corrected. - Line 190: Corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	Abstract: Line three of methodology after 700 m should be "were" instead of was. line 7 from methodology state the specific distance or its approximation instead of "far enough". Line 13 after 1st area "was" not necessary, just say increased significantly...2 nd to the last line, taken (into) consideration for "in". Line 66: suggest 'not significant' for the first sentence. Line 203: prefer safer to "more safe". Conclusion: please, can you now confidently conclude that application of sulphur formulation in controlling some insect pests has no harmful effects on predators based on this work?	- " was " changed to "were" - Far enough (350 meters). - Line 66: " insignificant " meant <u>not significant</u> like " impossible - incorrect". - Line 203: If I used " safer " it should followed by " than ", so, than what?? - Conclusion: Based on the obtained results, it could be concluded that sulphur formulations is harmless to the adults of the tested predators, but is harm to the larval instars. So, one could not say in one word that sulphur is safe – in general – to the tested predators because of their immature stages.
Optional/General comments	Could lines 43-45 be taken as control? Why was F-test used instead of a complete analysis of variance (ANOVA) which is a multiple t-test for testing significance difference between many variables? Line 53: F-test is just a component of the test specifically to discriminate particular outliers which could reduce the precision in mean or standard deviation of replicate measurements. Line 222: check punctuation for consistency. Line 252: newer version of reference would be preferred if available, for this one is obsolete	- There were no many variables, a) one plant; b) one application rate; c) two predators, so how can I use complete analysis of variance or multiple t-test?? Please explain it for me!! - Line 222: what is that mean "check punctuation for consistency"?? - Line 252: newer version of reference concerning the use of the new generation of insecticide and many pesticide formulations, which was not my research point. I was carried out an experiment using cheapest natural product.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	