



SDI Review Form 1.6

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 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Title must be changed to [Toxicity of insecticides in <i>Duponchelia fovealis</i> Zeller (Lepidoptera: Crambidae), a new strawberry pest in Brazil Under laboratory conditions] 2- As for the insecticides did not induce any mortality (lambda-cyhalothrin, milbemectin, cyromazine, thiamethoxam, methoxyfenozide and deltamethrin), author either remove them from list of tested insecticides or uses more series of their concentrations, <i>i.e.</i>, results of these insecticides should be presented in the table with its percentages of mortality. 3- The author tested the 2nd larval instar, why?? Is this instar is the destructive one? Or did the author be sure that he could exactly timing the abundance of this instar at the field application? 4- It is usually carrying out any assessment on 2nd, 4th 6th instars or 3rd and 5th instars, so, why did author tested the 2nd instar only??. 5- The the author mentioned in Table (1) that he used $P < 0.001$, but legend 1 was $P < 0.05$ why?? 6- In discussion, author mentioned that this pest has some degree of resistance/ tolerance to the active ingredients!! While the author tested some insecticides to control this pest. Did the author follow the proper methods and steps to calculate the resistant level?? If not this statement must be revised. 7- The recommendation for using an insecticide must be proposed after laboratory, semi-field and field experiments, but not only the laboratory results obtained. 8- Usually we evaluate mortality percentages after 24h of spraying, why author omit this time?? Please explain. 9- When we examine the mortality percentages check data (untreated control) must be present in the table – as a reference of mortality – but not use the corrected mortality, then when we read the table we said, for example, xxx is significant compared to the control (with 0 or other less value), but in the present table author compared insecticides with each other. 10- Results and Discussion must be rewritten according the new statistical results. 11- In Conclusion: the author mentioned that: Of the insecticides tested, indoxacarb, lambda-cyhalothrin + chlorantraniliprole and chlorfenapyr were the most effective for the control of <i>D. fovealis</i>, Under laboratory conditions, without mentioned the effect of all other tested insecticides, the first being the one with the highest toxicity (<LC₅₀) and can be used in <i>D. fovealis</i> integrated management programs, after more semi-field and field trials 	
Minor REVISION comments	All comments are illustrated in the attached manuscript.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Mohamed Ahmed GESRAHA</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>National Research Centre, Egypt</i>