



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_50350
Title of the Manuscript:	Henosepilachna vigintioctopunctata (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae: Epilachninae) attacking cultivated and wild crops in Brazil
Type of the Article	Short communication

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	In spite of being a short communication, to abound in details of methodology and results would make the publication more robust. Surely, the authors have the necessary information to complete the article. In the text of the manuscript are added comments that leave raised the questions that arise from the reading and that can not be answered with the methodology and the results presented.	
Minor REVISION comments	The wording has been a bit neglected, among other details the name of the species had to be corrected in the title, the bibliography does not follow the rules of the Journal, the lines were not numbered, etc. These and other minor revisions and corrections are found in the text. See control of changes in the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	The subject is interesting and the article could be published after being reviewed.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Iris Beatriz
Department, University & Country	University of Republic, Uruguay