



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_43600
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of IPM packages based on effective insecticides and bio-pesticides for controlling tomato fruit borer
Type of the Article	Original Research 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe each abbreviation used for the first time; - Line 8 (abstract): insert the scientific name of the species + (order: family); - Line 9: remove the word "was" before consisted; - Remove the same keywords used in the title; - Line 47 (introduction): the species was not mentioned before. Use the full name of the tomato fruit borer: <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner) (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae); - Lines 63-65: Insert references of the problems caused by the intensive application of insecticides and to the use of integrated pest management; - Line 73: mention which "few works has been conducted to determine the efficacy of botanicals to control tomato fruit borer"; - Lines 75-79 (objectives of the study): need to improve the text and remove the repeated phrase "effective insecticides and bio-pesticides against tomato fruit borer"; - Better describe the "data recorded" and statistical analyses sections. What was the period of evaluation? How the insects was captured and identified? Larvae and adults were collected? Which equipment was used for the analyses? - Remove lines 149-151 (results); - Line 153: differences WERE observed; - Lines 485-486: insert the full name of each mentioned species; - Benefit Cost analysis (results) was not mentioned in the methodology; - Line 502: "Sardana et al. (2013)". See authors' guideline; - In the conclusion, why the mentioned treatment was more effective against the fruit borer of tomato? Describe the conclusions based on the main results for each parameter investigated in the study. Remove "From the present study it was concluded that". 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is recommended not to use abbreviations in the title; - Define IPM packages; - Line 6 (abstract): Initiate with the objective of the study. Aiming to develop... - In the abstract, need to better describe all the variables investigated in the study; 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to separate the sections from the introduction; Second paragraph is too big and confusing; - In general, the introduction is good and express the importance of the study. However, need to improve the organization of the ideas; - Is there any information about the economic damage caused in tomatoes in the region? Explore the importance to control this pest. - Insert the name of the companies and respective country for each product mentioned in "Material and Methods" section; - Line 135: the formula of infestation is not configured in the text; - Could land preparation affect results of the study? The land preparation is better describe than the treatments. How the solutions were prepared and used in the field? - According to which reference the mid, late and total fruiting and ripening stage of tomatoes were adopted? - In table 1, 0.05 or 0.01 was the level of significant adopted? Inform the F, df and P values, besides C.V. Inform the complete name of the statistical analysis in the legend. - Line 221: use IPM instead of integrated pest management; - How was healthy tomato considered? 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victor Wilson Botteon
Department, University & Country	University of São Paulo, Brazil