



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_45722
Title of the Manuscript:	Biology and Dispersal of the Watermelon Bug Coridius viduatus (F.) Heteroptera: Dinidoridae on Different CucurbitCrops, in North Darfur State, Sudan.
Type of the 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the research gap? (What has been done and what has not been done).This should be shown in Introduction 2. Were the data analysed? Which design was used? Which analysis method was used (all of these should be shown in Materials and Methods) 3. Show some statistics in the results of survey work and others like line 167-170 	<p>No Works Werwe done in the Sudan about this pest, very Mégare, if not entirely absent information on the movement from sheltering site to watermelon fields and other way some biology aspect had been tackle but at different ecological zones and also different cropping system</p> <p>In Survey we used descriptive methods we identified the sheltering sites and descibe the nature of the pest movement.</p> <p>In Food preference and non-preference experiment . A Complete Randomized Block Design was used. Analysis of variance was done followed by least significant difference Lsd.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 158-165: show some statistics eg line 158..... greater number, how greater is that and compared to which one? 2. Line 238-remove the word DISCUSSION 3. 4. I would suggest to separate results from discussion 5. Line 240:Table 4. The results seems to be analysed. The design and analysis method used not stated in materials and methods 	<p>We cont the pest number on sheltering sites here I mean by greater huge not for comparison.</p> <p>ok</p> <p>The Table4 data had been analysed analysis of variance and least significant difference was carried out.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	