



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_40436
Title of the Manuscript:	Activity rhythm of the banana weevil, <i>Cosmopolites sordidus</i> Germar (Coleoptera: Curculionidae)
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>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comments (if agreed with reviewer, correct <i>the manuscript</i> and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The author need to structure the abstract to capture the title of the paper, methodology used, location of the study, results and conclusion. The references sited where relevant but NOT adequate. About 65% of the those consulted were too old. The oldest Cuille (1950) NOT LISTED. More recent ones should be referred. The statistical tool used in the analysis should be stated and at what probability level (if any). The timing of the trial (period -when) was not stated in the materials and methods for easy duplication of the trial somewhere. Tables 2 especially should be formatted as Table 1. The research did not capture natural periodicity (r), as such its mention should be expunged (removed). There are no supporting data. The author should provide a separate conclusion based on the findings obtained from the trial. NOT JAM PACKING DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION In the reference section, Bottrell, D.G. (1979) comes before Budenberg, W.J., Ndiege, I.O, & Karago, F. (1993)	Abstract updated accordingly (with concise/abridged info on every aspect of the work) All available and relevant references on subject, have been duly cited. Goggle search was done (and no newer & relevant references were available for further citing). The reference (Cuille, 1950) was erroneously omitted in the earlier draft, but has now been accordingly listed. The statistical tools used in this work (Student's T-test TABLE 1; and simple correlation analysis TABLE 2) plus the respective probability levels are all indicated in this manuscript. Table 2 has been formatted accordingly as recommended. The section on natural periodicity (r) has been expunged as recommended. A Conclusion section has been added accordingly; thus making it stand distinct from the Discussion. The detected error in the Reference listing has been according corrected (Bottrell, 1979 now comes before Budenberg et al 1993).
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper if published will provide baseline information about the pest ecology and population dynamics. However, looking at it now (in 2018), there must be some recent studies carried out.. The author should endeavour to use Google search engine and other sources to abridge himself rather than using obsolete literatures.	A very thorough search was done on subject before this write-up. All appropriate and relevant references on subject have been cited. The Literature on subject, especially with reference to this pest (or weevils generally) is scanty.