



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50116
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of insecticides in <i>Duponchelia fovealis</i> Zeller (Lepidoptera: Crambidae), a new strawberry pest in Brazil
Type of Article:	Original Research Articles

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
<p>1- The author wrote [When the correction of natural mortality is made by the formula proposed by Abbott (1925) the mortality value of the control treatment is omitted because it was removed from each treatment. If the control results were not performed the control would be presented.] I am know very well what is the mean of corrected mortality, but in any evaluation of the resulted mortality for some insecticides/pesticides we uses the original percent mortality in any statistical analysis – including control mortality – but not use the corrected mortality, that to use the percentage of control mortality as a reference for comparison. The author compares the tested insecticides without any reference to compare with, but he compare the insecticides with each other, this is not correct.</p> <p>2- The author mentioned the name of all insecticides tested with its 0-value of all but not includes them in the analysis and had no categorized letter; this also incorrect. Please correct.</p> <p>3- The author wrote [In the table is reported p-value observed. In the legend is reported reference p-value for analysis. The norms of the journal do not accept to inform the p-value observed complete.] I think that author had a conflicted between the α-value [5% in field experiments and 1% in laboratory experiments] and <i>P</i>- value. Then author should mention either α-value or <i>P</i>- value in statistical section or as legends.</p> <p>4- In Table (2) on what basis did the author use (a, b & c) letters?? Please explain.</p>	<p>1 – The original mortality was presented and the control included in the analysis, as requested.</p> <p>2 – Another reviewer requested that other untested products be added to the table. To avoid unnecessary confusion, the 0 values were removed because they were not used in the analysis.</p> <p>3 – Done.</p> <p>4 – An explanation was added in the text as well. The letters were inserted because the confidence intervals of each insecticide did not overlap, meaning that they differed from each other. In this way the letters were inserted to leave this information explicitly to the reader.</p>