



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_42953
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Different Levels of Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium on Insect and Pests in T. Aman Rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.)
New Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF NITROGEN, PHOSPHORUS AND POTASSIUM (NPK) APPLICATION ON INSECT PESTS INFESTING TRANSPLANTING AMAN RICE (ORYZA SATIVA L.)
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>The manuscript has been revised substantially. However, further revision is required concerning the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The interpretation of the significance of your findings should not be presented in the conclusion, but in section "Results and discussion". - Lines 41-42: the sentence "The estimated loss of rice in Bangladesh due to insect pests and diseases amounts to 1.5 to 2.0 million tons (Siddique, 1992)" should be "the annual estimated loss of rice in Bangladesh due to insect pests and diseases amounts to 1.5 to 2.0 million tons (Siddique, 1992)". Note that this estimated loss might change over the years (more than 20 years after the report cited here). Please look for the more recent publication. - Lines 64-66: abbreviations "IPM and BPH" should be fully given at the first use - Line 67: the words "et al." should be changed to an italic front - Table 1: please add as footnote the following sentence: "In a column means having similar letter(s) are statistically identical and those having dissimilar letter(s) differ significantly as per 0.05 level of probability" - Line 129: please this section should be numbered as "3.1" - Sections "3.1.2 to 3.1.7" should be "3.1.1 to 3.1.6" - Section 3.4: please discuss why the number of rice hispa was lower from T₅ than T₁ treatments, because according to authors you cited to justify your finding the number of rice hispa should be lower from T₁ than T₅ in contrast to your result. - References 9, 14, 16, 19: please check and correct for page numbers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed interpretation and significance of implication has been added in a separate 'Discussion' section. 2. Recent data has been added with correction 3. Other corrections have been revised and edited