



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50116
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicity of insecticides in Duponchelia fovealis Zeller (Lepidoptera: Crambidae), a new strawberry pest in Brazil
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The title is inappropriate for the essence of the text and seems unclear, so I suggested (in the manuscript) a more appropriate title: &lt; Effectiveness of some insecticides in control of Duponchelia fovealis Zeller (Lepidoptera: Crambidae) a new strawberry parasite in Brazil&gt;. Also, this suggestion is optional, as long as it was accepted at first technical consultation by editorial board.</p> <p>Both the material and method and the results are missing the reference year / period. Practically, no chapter and nothing in the paper reveals the period during which the observations that were the subject of the research were made.</p> <p>A sentence should be inserted with the exact name of the laboratory in which the studies were conducted. The name of the Sector (as it is presented here) is too generic or it is necessary to convince the existence of adequate space and materials with the research of the work.</p> <p>The result text is too synthetic. It is necessary to have a detailed interpretation of the graphs/ each chemical product used (in Figure 1), both individually and comparatively.</p> <p>Discussions are too detailed compared to results. The part of the actual results (data) could pass to the results. Or it could remain in this form but then it is necessary to detail the results.</p> <p>Conclusions should be made with a reference to the program and management strategy: with what other products should these chemicals be replaced or mixed (eg biological products)? How many treatments are needed? (One is enough ???). The conclusion must be precise and contribute to effective support and practical application.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>It is necessary to reread the whole work and carefully to write correctly where it is necessary. Sometimes the paragraphs are too short and it does not exactly understand what it is.</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>As a relatively new species reported in Brazil, a schematic showing some morpho-biological features, maybe even 1-2 original photos from the growth room/laboratory (integrated into a presentation).</p>	

**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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<i>Grozea Ioana</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania</i>