

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: JNAVES -006

Title: BIO-CONTROL OF RAW DIATOMACEOUS EARTH ALONE OR/IN COMBINATION WITH PERMETHRIN DUST AGAINST RHYZOPERTHA DOMINICA (COLEOPTERA: BOSTRYCHIDAE) ON STORED WHEAT (TRITICUMSPP).

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Id: JPR-174

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

This manuscript evaluates the efficacy of raw diatomaceous earth (DE), alone and in combination with permethrin dust, against *Rhyzopertha dominica* in stored wheat. The topic is relevant and significant for stored grain protection and aligns with the need for alternative pest management strategies due to restrictions on synthetic insecticides.

The study demonstrates that higher doses of DE, especially when combined with permethrin, significantly increase adult mortality, suppress progeny production, and reduce grain damage.

The experimental approach is generally appropriate, and the findings contribute useful information to stored-product pest management.

However, several issues should be addressed before publication:

1. Language and Grammar:

The manuscript contains numerous grammatical errors, inconsistent sentence structures, and typographical mistakes. Extensive English editing is required to improve readability and clarity.

2. Title and Formatting:

The title is lengthy and inconsistently formatted (e.g., spacing, scientific names). Scientific names should be italicized and properly written throughout the manuscript.

3. Abstract:

The abstract is overly long and contains grammatical errors. It should be concise and clearly structured (background, methods, results, conclusion).

REVIEWER'S REPORT**4. Introduction:**

While informative, the introduction is repetitive in some sections and needs better flow. Some references appear outdated or improperly formatted.

5. Materials and Methods:

- Experimental design description is unclear (e.g., split-split-plot justification).
- Units and formatting (mg/kg, °C, etc.) should be standardized.
- Some procedures need clearer explanation for reproducibility.

6. Results Section:

- Results are generally well presented but contain grammatical errors.
- Tables need better formatting and clearer captions.
- Some values and statistical interpretations require clarification.

7. Discussion:

- The discussion adequately compares findings with previous studies but lacks depth in explaining mechanisms.
- Some repetition of results instead of interpretation.

8. Conclusion:

The conclusion is valid but should be rewritten more clearly and concisely, avoiding repetition of results.

9. Referencing:

- In-text citations and reference formatting are inconsistent.
- Ensure all cited works are properly listed and follow journal style.

Overall Evaluation:

The manuscript has scientific merit and practical relevance but requires minor revisions mainly related to language, formatting, and clarity before it can be considered for publication.