



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEA_28611
Title of the Manuscript:	Nematicidal efficacy of fluensulfone against false root-knot nematode (<i>Nacobbus aberrans</i>) in cucumber crop under field conditions
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		
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should give more information on experimental site e.g. annual rainfall, temperature and relative humidity. Furthermore, authors should describe soil type and soil classification of the experimental site location. Authors should write full meaning of the abbreviated words as the footnote in Figure 1 e. g OX- oxamyl, The significant differences indicated by A should be written in lower case letter and close to the number. In references section, cited literatures should be arranged alphabetically and one system of citation should be adopted.	1. We agree with the reviewer to add more information on experimental site. 2. We agree with the reviewer to indicate full meaning to abbreviated words. 3. We agree with the reviewer to write significant differences close to numbers. 4. We do not agree with the reviewer in the comment about references because According to General Guideline for Authors: References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text not alphabetically as suggested by the reviewer.
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link: <http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>