



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_38815
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Effects of Piper guineense Emulsion and Cabbage-Tomato Intercropping for Mitigating Cabbage Pest Infestation and Improving Performance
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	1. The results section in abstract is lengthy. You should remember that abstract contains a summary of the work. 2. Line 87 – Replace “is” with “was”. 3. Remove underlining sub-subsections. 4. Statistical analysis – Why did you use $p = 0.05$ and not $p < 0.05$? 5. Line 324 – How could a positive correlation be $r = - 0.71$? Did you really check it? You should revisit this. 6. <i>et al.</i> is written in <i>italics</i>.	1. The result section seems to be lengthy because the results are significant and need to be highlighted in the abstract while maintaining the journal's guide. Hence, attempting to reduce the abstract results will eliminate significant results from the abstract, which would not be good for the MS quality and the scientific audience of JAERI. BESIDES, THE ABSTRACT IS BELOW THE 300 WORDS LIMIT THAT IS RECOMMENDED BY SCIENCEDOMAIN. 2. Done, and the MS read over again and all similar errors corrected accordingly. 3. We have checked for conformity, but underlining the subsections is in accordance with the journal's format in the author's guide. 4. We have checked for conformity, but using $P = .05$ INSTEAD of $P < 0.05$ is in accordance with the journal's format in the author's guide. 5. We have checked and corrected the error as remarked by the reviewer. 6. Writing et al. in italics as recommended by the reviewer is not stipulated in the SCIENCEDOMAIN author guidelines. However, since the reviewer raised concerns on this, we decided to stick with the journal's author guideline, which says that references cited in the text should be numbered in brackets. Hence we have adapted all the et al. into numbers in the brackets according to the journal guidelines.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		