



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_41008
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of pesticides application on epidaphic invertebrate community in tomato cultivation
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	The experimental design: The Native Atlantic Forest cannot be used as a control area since the invertebrate population in the cultivated soil is quite different from the forest or uncultivated areas. Hence comparing this with the tomato production areas when evaluating the effects of pesticides is a big mistake! • The control plots were supposed to be in the tomato cultivated areas with the same soil type but where synthetic pesticides were not applied. • Remember the composition of soil organisms may change depending on the type of crop that is grown as well as the quality or characteristics of the soil. • Even your discussion is not relating the effect of pesticides to the invertebrate population but rather to the different ecosystems (cultivated and uncultivated land), for example line 189-194. This show deviation from the aim of the study mostly because the control area was not well chosen.	
Minor REVISION comments	Title: Impact of pesticides application on epidaphic invertebrate community in tomato cultivation Do you mean apidaphic or edaphic? Please recheck!!! Introduction Line 31: ----- ecosystemic ecosystem functions, sometimes ignored, since they mainly act ---- Line 35: epiedaphic??? Line 37: considered as natural enemies Line 38: epigeic??? fauna Line 40: epigephic??? and non-target coleoptera fauna Line 49: being As' by the of ??? Not clear Line 52-53: ----- in commercial tomato cultivation, as SUPERA (Treatment 1) and TY10 (Treatment 2) varieties,---. Why did you use different varieties? The different varieties may influence the soil organisms differently depending on their metabolites. Line 64: Pest control was carried out daily from the beginning to the end of tomato cultivation cycle. Do you mean the pesticides were being applied every day? Be precise! Line 51: Were all the pesticides applied in all the experimental plots equally? Did you monitored its application or you just asked the farmers to mention the pesticides they used? Line 73: 2.2 Epiedaphic??? community sampling Line 74: epigeic??? Fauna Line 79-80: For the maize crop, Badji et al. (2007) identified that Coleoptera families was sensitive to pesticide application. Not needed here Line 106: epigraphic??? Fauna Line 108: Table 2: How can you differentiate the effect of tomato varieties from the effect of pesticides applied to the population of soil fauna? Line 118: epiedaphic??? Fauna Line 117: 2017). which may ----. Check the use of punctuation marks and how to begin a sentence! Line 120: ---- addition of chicken litter ----- Did you also check this? Line 126: as well as especially those ----- Line 130: ----- due to the intensification of the control practices of the STB. Did you check the application rates in each period? Avoid assumption! Line 155: In the latter study. What do you mean? Is it published? Give reference! Line 159: Give a reference that relates effects of rainfall to invertebrate population in the soil to support your argument. Line 170: Give the implication of figure 3	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 178: contributed the most to the separation of the areas??? Line 185-188: Too long sentence, not meaningful! Rephrase! Line 226: helped discriminate treatments???. What do you mean? What is its significance? Line 227: detritivoria???. Check the spelling!!! Line 229-230: ----- so much so that there was practically no presence of these insects were absent in the areas cultivated with tomatoes Line 231-232: --- which does not occur in the present study, since several insecticides are applied in tomato crops. Do you mean the pesticides need to be mixed together? Clarify on the proper use of these pesticides Line 234: were not significantly different among to discriminate the areas Line 235-236: However, the impact of such pesticides on the identification of species-level beetles is not known. Are you sure? Please check the use of the words; epidaphic, epiedaphic, epigeic and epigephic, epigraphic!!! These words have been used interchangeably throughout the text, which is not correct! The word discrimination has been incorrectly used!!! Its use in some of the sentences in the text might mean dominance. Rephrase the statements where this word has been misused References: Make sure all references are well written as per the requirements of the Journal. All references in the text must be in the reference list and vice versa.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There is a need to change the aim of the study since you can't assess impacts of pesticides on invertebrates in tomato cultivation while the control is set in the forest or uncultivated area. Remember the tomato cultivated areas and the uncultivated areas characterized as native Atlantic Forest are two different ecosystems with different invertebrate communities.	

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:	Prisila A. Mkenda
Department, University & Country	Department of Biosciences, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania