SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Experimental Agriculture International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JEAI_45920**
Title of the Manuscript:	**CONTROL OF MAIZE STEM BORER (Busseola fusca F.) INFESTATION USING EXTRACTS OF Carica papaya and Cymbopogon citratus AND FURADAN IN UMUDIKE.**
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)

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	**Abstract:** include numeric values of the results **Introduction** **-** be consistent on citation in the text eg line 37, the reference Mbah and Ogbodo 2013 should be removed and write the reference number as listed in reference list -be consistent in writing reference number in text (Line 40). Reference number 24 may not come before 23, 22, 21,20……15 etc. These should be written in chronological order -numbering of reference in text should start with smallest number eg, 1, 22, 25,27 etc. (see line 64) **Materials and Methods** **-**The design is not clear; You have 3 maize varieties, three treatments (two plant extracts each with two levels?), one Synthetic insecticide (Furadan) and Untreated control. The treatments are not clearly stated in this section. 1. Did you set three different experiments for each maize variety (if yes, then we should expect to have separate data from each variety). 2. Why air dried of the plant materials for two weeks and not for one week or more than two weeks (any reference for this?) 3.What have you based on choosing the application rates of the plant extracts and Furadan? 4. Why three varieties (is there any special issue with varieties). 5. Where are the data for the varieties? 6. Section 2.4 should come before section 2.3. In yield assessment: mention exacly when harvesting was done (range of 75 -80 is ambiguous). 7. What statistical tool did you use to run ANOVA? How did you separate the means? **Results** - **Table captions should be written before the table and not below the table** **According to tables; your treatments are** *Cymbopogon citratus* leaf ash (3g), *Carica papaya* leaf ash (3g), *Carica papaya* seed powder (4.5g) , Furadan (1.5g) and Control . These were not clearly stated in materials and Methods.	The experimental design is a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The treatments are the plant materials and Furadan applied at the stated rates. We did not set up three different experiments. The purpose of air drying plant materials is to ensure that the active ingredients are intact. It can be one or two weeks depending on the room temperature. The choice of application rates was based on previous trials. The three varieties are those commonly cultivated in the Umudike agroecosystem. The main focus of this research work was the use of plant materials for the control of maize stem borer. The statistical tool used for Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) is GENSTAT DISCOVERY EDITION and significant means were separated by Least Significant Difference (LSD) at 5% level of probability.
Minor REVISION comments	- **Check out some typographical errors and correct** **References** -Check the Journal Guidelines for authors on how to write references in a consistence manner	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* The ethical issue here is the use of Furadan or Carbofuran which is one of those synthetic pesticides banned. The use here is for the purpose of indigenous plant extracts that will replace Furadan in due course.	