



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |                                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">American Journal of Experimental Agriculture</a>                                                                                    |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJEA_28611</b>                                                                                                                            |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Nematicidal efficacy of fluensulfone against false root-knot nematode (<i>Nacobbus aberrans</i>) in cucumber crop under field conditions</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Original Research Article</b>                                                                                                                |

**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**

|                                            | <b>Reviewer's comment:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments | <p>A good manuscript with potential to be published after minor revision. Important is to include a brief discussion on recommendations on the abstract.</p> <p>More description on watering, fertilizers, indexing and the scale. Tables and figures should be clear so that they can stand alone, meaning they can be understood without referring to the ms.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments      | <p>See.</p> <p>Line 13: "...(Nacobbus aberrans (Thorne, 1935) Thorne &amp; Allen, 1994)" – shouldn't it be numbers instead of names and year? Follow the guide to authors.</p> <p>Line 22: "...little toxic..." – change to less toxic.</p> <p>Line 27: "...relatively low toxic..." – relatively less toxic</p> <p>Line 32: "...being this country the second largest..." – this country being the second largest....</p> <p>Line 64: Was one row an experimental unit? So one treatment was applied in a full row. Just make it clear in the description. 6 treatments X 4 reps X 12m2</p> <p>Line 65: 13-40-13 which brand? How fertilizer was applied in kgs? How much water was applied in mm? This is very important as the two have an impact on nematodes.</p> <p>Line 67: Cross country F1 variety....</p> <p>Line 89: "...by comparison with a visual scale." Describe the scale. Did you have low, moderate and severe infestation? How did you scale?</p> <p>Line 90: Describe how the galling index was done.</p> <p>Line 122: "...with values ranging from 1.75 to 2.25</p> |                                                                                                                                                                                      |



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |  |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
|                                         | <p>juveniles...". According to table 1, the initial populations ranged from 2.00 to 2.50. The initial plant population was not the results of treatments and therefore it is confusing to say there were no significant differences across treatments. Rather mention that the initial plant population is the experimental field ranged between .....</p> <p>Line 126 – 127: "Fluensulfone treatments significantly differed oxamyl and negative controls...". Rephrase.</p> <p>Line 128: "...final population densities ranged from 6.25 to 8.75...". According to table 1, the final population ranged from 6.25 to 30.50. otherwise the authors should make it clear that the range is for the fluensulfone treatment only.</p> <p>Line 135: "...due exposed to lethal and sublethal doses of pesticides." Change to "... due to exposure to...".</p> <p>Line 140: Rephrase</p> |  |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |  |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |                                                                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name:                            | <b><i>Motiki Meshack Mofokeng</i></b>                                              |
| Department, University & Country | <b><i>Crop Science Department, Agricultural Research Council, South Africa</i></b> |