



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_39564
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Combined Ash and Terbuphos as Preplanting Corm Treatment to Manage Corm Borer Weevils (<i>Cosmopolites sordidus</i>) on Plantains and Stimulate Growth
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	Corm Borer Weevils (<i>Cosmopolites sordidus</i>) is one of the major insect pests of banana in Cameroon and other parts of the world and cause significant reductions in yields. The insect pest is mainly controlled by synthetic insecticides which always do not give desirable results and their efficacy should be enhanced by the addition of different ingredients. In this manuscript the authors have tested the efficacy of an insecticide by adding ash. Therefore, the submitted manuscript is informative and provides new information. The manuscript is well written, however, there are some weaknesses in the manuscript which should be addressed before its acceptance. The abstract is good; however, some of the sentences of the abstract are not grammatically correct. In the "introduction" the authors did not review the literature related to the subject. The objectives have been described clearly. The materials and methods section is consistent with the results. Following points need to be addressed in the Materials and Methods section. The geographic location of the experimental site on the globe should be provided The soil analysis of the experimental site should be provided. Please provide the average temperature of the location and other environmental parameters. The experimental design of the field experiment should be RCBD rather than CRD as described in the abstract. Why the authors used 20 g ash and the insecticide alone and not mixed with each other's while in other combinations these have been mixed and not tested alone. The results have not been presented properly. The authors are advised to squeeze the results by giving some important information and then referring to the tables or figures which contained the information or data. The results have not been discussed properly. The authors in most of the cases have just said that their results are in line with those of others'. The headings should be removed from this section. Please revise the conclusion and make some recommendation at the end. References do not conform to the style of the journal. The authors' names are not as per format of the journal. In some cases wrong journal abbreviations have been used. In some instances the authors used journal abbreviations while in other cases full journal names have been used. The author should be consistent in writing journal names. Similarly, the citations in the text also deviate from the recommended style of the journal. The authors are directed to use the correct journal title abbreviations for all citations. There are several websites that provide journal abbreviations, e.g. the Caltech Library website: http://library.caltech.edu/reference/abbreviations/. Double-check all the citations in the text to ensure that they are listed in the references list and vice versa, and for accuracy (correct author names, alphabetical order of references (see the instructions in the Author Information Pack on the journal's website), title of paper, year of publication, and journal volume and page numbers). The standard of English is poor. The manuscript is full of syntactical errors. There is no proper use of verbs, words, articles on numerous occasions. There were many cases in the manuscript where the sentences were not properly structured, suggesting that the paper would improve if it could be edited for language and technical correctness.	
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tariq Mukhtar</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Department of Plant Pathology, Pir Mehr Ali Shah Arid Agriculture University, Pakistan</i>