



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44031
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the insect pest population dynamics in common bean cultivars in relation to the foliar fertilization with potassium silicate.
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>)

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 paper is well written and easy to follow authors' statements. Being said that, I have some concerns about various sections of this manuscript which I am stating below: 1. The abstract must be rewritten with some research information. In fact, the abstract tells about materials and methods. By reading the abstract, readers will not have any idea about the most important outcome of this research studies. Abstract should carry the high light of this study. 2. Introduction is very insufficient. The author could talk more about the importance of various pests. 3. Materials and Methods section is very good. Line 48: Year should be mention with Koppen which I think 1984. 76: Seeds were treated with Admire which is a systemic insecticide and provide control to various insect pests. By using treated seed, how can author justify effect of their treatements? Line 93: kg⁻¹ should be kg.ha⁻¹ (I think) Line 99: Psi should be psi or PSI. Line 104: What is sampling points-describe clearly. Line 105-107: Describe method of collection, counting, etc. Line 134: Statistical analysis is poorly described. Data should be analyzed using repeated mesure ANOVA. Results and Discussion: Tables 1 and 2 show summary of ANOVA which authors can insert in the text with results. Authors should show results by cultivars and doses idependently in tabular format in different seasons for all groups of insects.	Thanks for your suggestion. We accept your considerations of correction. Corrections can be found highlighted in yellow in the text.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		