



A Study on Farmer Perception on the Incorporation of Cotton Stubbles to Control the Pink Boll Worm Incidence

**K. Ravi Kumar ^{a*}, J. Hemantha Kumar ^a, B. R. Madhushekar ^a, V. Chaitanya ^a,
W. Jessie Suneetha ^a, P. S. M. Phanisri ^a, D. Nagaraju ^a, R. Uma Reddy ^b
and J. V. Prasad ^c**

^a *Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Wyrā, Khammam-507165, Telangana State, India.*

^b *RARS, PJTSAU, Warangal-506006, India.*

^c *ICAR-ATARI, Santhosh Nagar, Hyderabad-500030, India.*

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2022/v12i111382

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/92632>

Original Research Article

Received 13 August 2022

Accepted 17 October 2022

Published 22 October 2022

ABSTRACT

Incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil after harvesting will help in reducing the pink boll worm incidence. The present study was conducted with an aim to determine the effectiveness and usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers. A total of 120 respondents were randomly selected in Khammam district and interviewed using a structured questionnaire during the year 2020-21. Ex-post facto research design was employed for the present study. The study revealed that, majority of the cotton farmers (59.17 per cent) had low level of perception followed by medium and high perception 23.33 and 17.50 percent respectively on incorporation of cotton stubbles for management of PBW. Further among the 120 respondents, 68 respondents opined that increase in yields per acre increased after stubble incorporation where the incorporated stubbles acted as manure to the crop and 52 respondents opined that there was no increase in yield per acre. 75.83 percent of the respondents suggested non-availability of the implement as the major constraint followed by 72.50 percent of the respondents opined that shredder is used once in the crop period and will remain idle for the major part of the season as is the second most major constraint.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: wyrakvinfo2@gmail.com;

Keywords: Pink boll worm; adoption; knowledge; cotton stubbles incorporation; shredder.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Cotton (*Gossypium* spp.) is the most prominent crop producing natural fibre, fuel and edible oil and playing an important role in Indian economy” [1,2]. “It has been under commercial cultivation for domestic consumption and export needs of 111 countries in the world” [3,4] and hence it is called “King of Fibres” or “White Gold”. Cotton is grown in an area of 11.73 m ha with a production of 39.00 m bales and productivity of 565 Kg ha⁻¹. India is the second-largest country to produce cotton after China [5]. Telangana is the country's second state in terms of area (23.58 lakh ha), third in terms of production of 57.97 lakh bales and seventh in terms of productivity of 418 kg/ha) during 2020-21 (Cotton Corporation of India, 2022). “Among the major insects which infest cotton, especially the bollworms [6] viz., American bollworm, *Helicoverpa armigera* (Hubner), Spiny bollworm, *Earias insulana* (Boiusduval), Spotted bollworm, *Earias vittella* (Fabricius) and Pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) normally referred as bollworm complex, pose greater threat to cotton production” [7,8].

“Among the boll worms, the pink bollworm *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) has recently emerged as a severe concern to cotton production in India. Pink bollworm larvae feed on cotton plant flowers, buds, bolls, and seeds, causing malformed flowers, premature opening and heavy shedding of infested bolls, decreased fiber length, and poor lint quality due to staining” [9]. “Synthetic pyrethroids, which were first introduced in India in the 1980s, were crucial in combating this notorious pest and on the other hand, the intensive use of chemical insecticides caused widespread ecological harm in the cotton climate, resulting in bollworm exacerbation and secondary pest problems” [10,11,12]. Following that, the development of genetically engineered transgenic cotton containing genes encoding delta-endotoxin proteins from the entomo pathogenic soil bacterium *Bacillus thuringiensis* opened up new avenues for the management of the dreaded cotton bollworm. Since then, the Indian cotton ecosystem has seen remarkable changes in its pest status [13,14].

“Bt cotton technology performed well and offered promising boll-worm complex control. As a result, PBW infestations were very low in the first

decade after Bt cotton was released. *H. armigera* and *E. vitella* still susceptible even after 15 years of continuous Bt cotton cultivation in India. However, PBW reappeared as a major pest problem in India's central and southern cotton growing belt. PBW populations were reported to have developed resistance to Cry1Ac and were found to survive on Bt-I cotton fields in 2009 in Gujarat State in India, but were being effectively controlled by the dual-gene Bt-II cotton” [6]. “However, Surveys conducted across India showed progressive increases in the survival rate of PBW larvae in green bolls of Bt-II cotton F1 hybrid varieties” [15].

“Pink bollworm incidence goes unnoticed to the farmers since young larvae enter the cotton boll in the developing stage and remains inside by feeding on seeds. Its damage will be seen only when bad opened bolls with damaged seeds were found at harvesting stage. Non removal of stubbles and discarded damaged bolls left over in the cotton fields for larger period narrowed the interval between two seasons and it could support pest survival in off season and form an important link in the carryover of the pest” [16,17]. Moth activity seen throughout the year may be due to cotton stubbles and damaged bolls left over in the field even after harvesting which narrowed the interval between two cropping seasons and incidence carried to next season. Similar observation was made by Simwat and Sidhu [17] in Punjab that stalks of cotton stubbles were the major source for carryover of pink bollworm.

“Further, Burning any crop residue in general and cotton in stalks in particular is laborious, time consuming and costly (Rs.4375 ha⁻¹ for cotton). It also leads to environmental pollution. Burning emits a large number of hazardous pollutants” [18]. “Burning leads to emissions of greenhouse gases like CO₂, NO_x, SO_x, NH₃ and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). It affects air quality and visibility in the urban areas because of already existing pollutants due to vehicular and industrial pollution. Finally, it leads to global warming and climate change” [19]. “Heat generated due to burning kills soil microorganisms and eco-friendly insects too. Cotton stalks contain about 67.3-70% holocellulose, 24.3-28.2% lignin and 5.9-8.3% ash. They are rich in nutrients with 51.0% C, 4.9% H, 0.62-1.0% N, 0.61-0.68% K, 0.08-0.1% P, 0.43% Ca, 0.15% S and 0.12% Mg, 324 ppm

Fe, 147 ppm Mn, 27 ppm Zn, 9 ppm Cu and 1.6 ppm Mo" [20,21]. So, burning leads to loss of valuable soil organic matter and nutrients. Under the circumstances considering the emergence pattern of this pest, the present study was conducted to determine the effectiveness and usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ex-post facto research design was followed for the study and Random sampling method was used for selecting the respondents. The present study was conducted in Khammam district of Telangana State during 2020-21. In Khammam district, majority of the soils are having low levels of Nitrogen, High levels of Phosphorous and medium levels of Potassium. Study was conducted to determine the effectiveness and usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers without burning the stubbles. This study is based on primary data collected from cotton farmers. Random sampling technique was adopted in designing sampling frame for the study. Telangana state is selected purposively. In the second stage, Khammam district was selected. Accordingly, in third stage six villages were selected randomly based on potentiality. From each of the selected villages, twenty number of cotton growers were selected randomly i.e. 120 cotton farmers were considered for the present study who incorporated cotton stubbles into the soil. The Primary data was collected from the farmers through personal interview with the help of well-prepared pre-tested schedules and questionnaire. The farmers were classified based on their socio demographic profile. The profile of trainees ranged from illiterates to post graduates, with age ranging from 22 years and more, farm size ranging from less than 2.5 acres to more than 2.5 acres. The data obtained were analyzed simply by frequency and percentage in order to assess the usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers. The standard formula by Ansari and Chandargi [22] was used to calculate the knowledge gain frequency and percentage.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results from the study conducted on the effectiveness and usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers are given below in Table 1.

3.1 Profile Characteristics of Respondents

It can be inferred from Table 1 that nearly 44.17 percent of the respondents were in the middle age group, 65.83 percent of the respondents had high school or above education levels, with nearly three quarters of the respondents had 2.5 or above farm size (75.84%) and 86.67 percent of the respondents had more than 5years of experience in farming, 46.67 percent of the farmers had an area of 2.5 to 5acres under cotton, 45.00 percent of the respondents had membership in one organization, 40.00 percent of the farmers participated in two trainings conducted in Cotton by extension agencies, 58.33 percent of the farmers had agriculture as the farming system, 65.83 percent of the farmers had medium extension contacts. The results are in tune with the findings of Madhu shaker et al. [23], who reported similar findings of medium extension contact among selected respondents.

3.2 Knowledge Levels of Cotton Farmers on Package of Practices on Cotton Stubble Incorporation

It can be inferred from Table 2 that 38.33 percent of the farmers had medium level of knowledge on cotton stubble incorporation for management of PBW followed by 34.16 percent with medium knowledge levels and 27.50 percent of the farmers under low knowledge level category. The findings are similar to the findings of Madhu shaker et al. [23].

3.3 Distribution of Respondents According to Management Practices Adopted by Farmers to Control PBW

It can be indicated from Table 3 that 40.83 percent of the farmers felt that pheromone traps are best management practices for monitoring of PBW followed by collection and destruction of rosette flowers by 29.17 percent of the farmers. Among preventive measures 34.17 percent of farmers felt sowing of Non Bt as refugee crop as the best preventive measure followed by use of shredder for stubble incorporation by 26.67 percent of the respondents. 39.17 percent of the respondents avoided stacking of cotton stalks for fuel purpose as the major cultural measures adopted by them. 67.50 percent of the respondents considered use of need based insecticides as the best curative measure for management of PBW.

Table 1. Profile characteristics of respondents (n=120)

S. no	Variables	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	Age	Young (22-37)	29	24.17
		Middle (38-53)	53	44.17
		Old (54-69)	38	31.66
2	Education	Illiterate	09	7.50
		Primary school	13	10.83
		Upper school	19	15.83
		High school	28	23.33
		Intermediate	37	30.84
		Degree	09	7.50
		Post graduation	05	4.17
3	Farm Size	Marginal (0-2.5)	29	24.16
		Small (2.5-5)	58	48.34
		Large (5 & above)	33	27.50
4	Farming experience	< 5 year (less than 5 year)	16	13.33
		5–10 year	65	54.17
		>10 year (more than 10 year)	39	32.50
5	Area under Cotton	Low (less than 2.5 acres)	33	27.50
		Medium (2.5 – 5.0 acres)	56	46.67
		High (more than 5 acres)	31	25.83
6	Social participation	No participation	21	17.50
		Membership in one organization	54	45.00
		Membership in more than one organization	31	25.83
		Membership with office bearer	14	11.67
7	Trainings received/ participated	One training	29	24.17
		Two trainings	48	40.00
		Three trainings	27	22.50
		More than 3trainings	16	13.33
8	Farming system	Agriculture only	70	58.33
		Agriculture + Animal Husbandry	31	25.83
		Agriculture + Animal Husbandry + Horticulture	19	15.83
9	Extension contact (Mean = 5.78, S.D. = 2.72)	Low (< 28.13)	16	13.33
		Medium (28.13 – 43.13)	79	65.83
		High (> 43.13)	25	20.83

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to their knowledge in cotton crop (n=120)

S.no	Category	Range	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low level of Knowledge	26 – 34	33	27.50
2	Medium level of Knowledge	35 – 43	41	34.16
3	High level of Knowledge	44 - 52	46	38.33

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to management practices adopted by farmers to control PBW (n=120)

S.no	Management practices	Knowledge level	
		Frequency	Percentage
I	Monitoring of PBW		
1	Weekly monitoring	19	15.83
2	Collection & destruction of Rosette flowers	35	29.17
3	Damaged bolls	17	14.17
4	Pheromone traps	49	40.83
II	Preventive measures		
1	Avoid ratooning/ termination of the crop by December	11	9.17
2	Crop rotation	9	7.50
3	Sowing of Non Bt as refugee crop	41	34.17
4	Use of Shredder for stubble incorporation	32	26.67
5	Deep summer ploughing during April-May	27	22.50
III	Cultural measures		
1	Cattle grazing of the leftover field at the end of the crop season	37	30.83
2	Timely sowing (Sowing after receiving 50 mm rainfall)	11	9.17
3	Trap crops-Growing of bhendi as trap crop	25	20.83
4	Avoiding stacking of cotton stalks for fuel purpose over long periods	47	39.17
IV	Curative measures		
1	Spraying of Neem oil	21	17.50
2	Use of need based insecticides	81	67.50
3	Trichogramma egg cards soon after appearance of bollworms	05	4.17
4	Hand picking /killing and destruction of insect pests	13	10.83

Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to their extent of adoption in cotton crop (n=120)

S.no	Category	Criteria & Score	Frequency	Percentage
1	Low level of adoption	$<x - \frac{1}{2} SD (< 11.0)$	31	25.83
2	Medium level of adoption	$<x \pm \frac{1}{2} SD (< 11.1-22.0)$	47	39.16
3	High level of adoption	$>x + \frac{1}{2} SD (> 22.0)$	42	35.00

3.4 Adoption of the Recommended Package of Practices in Cotton

The data was collected on the extent of adoption of stubble incorporation by the farmers. The results from the Table 4 indicated that the percentage of the respondents according to their extent of adoption in cotton crop were categorized and ranged from 25.83% (Low), 39.16% (Medium) and 35.00% (High).

3.5 Perception of Cotton Farmers on Incorporation of Cotton Stubbles for Management of PBW

The data in Table 5 indicated that majority of the cotton farmers (59.17 per cent) had low level of perception followed by medium and high perception 23.33 and 17.50 percent respectively on incorporation of cotton stubbles for management of PBW.

Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to their level of perception on incorporation of cotton stubbles

S.no	Level of Perception	Number of farmers	Percentage
1	Low (< 98.71)	71	59.17
2	Medium (98.72 – 109.75)	28	23.33
3	High (> 109.75)	21	17.50

3.6 Economic Condition after Adopting the Cotton Shredder Technology

The results from the Table 6 indicated that the among the 120 respondents, 45 respondents opined that their level of improvement in annual income increased after stubble incorporation and 75 respondents opined that their level of improvement in annual income has not increased as they are yet to see the results. Further among the 120 respondents, 68 respondents opined that increase in yields per acre increased after stubble incorporation where the incorporated stubbles acted as manure to the crop and 52 respondents opined that there was no increase in yield per acre. Among the 120 respondents, 57 respondents opined that the total gross income is increased and 63 respondents opined that there is no total increase in gross income. Further among the 120 respondents, 53 respondents opined that the total net income is increased and 67 respondents opined that that there is no total increase in net income. The findings are in agreement with Ramanjaneyulu et al. [24] who

reported that use of shredder helps in saving income and improving soil fertility as the stalks acts as manure top the soil.

3.7 Constraints Elicited by the Respondent

The results from the Table 7 indicated that among the 120 respondents, 75.83 percent of the respondents suggested non-availability of the implement as the major constraint elicited by the farmers followed by 72.50 percent of the respondents opined that shredder is used once in the crop period and will remain idle for the major part of the season which is the second most major constraint. 67.50 percent of the respondents felt that since the initial cost of the implement is very high and also use of the implement is only for single purpose, they opined that government should give support inform of the subsidies/incentives for the purchase of the implement and popularizing habit of the incorporating the cotton stubbles into the soil by the farming community.

Table 6. Economic condition after adopting the cotton shredder technology (n=120)

S.no	Aspects	Adopted	Not adopted
1	Level of improvement in annual income	45 (37.50)	75 (62.50)
2	Increase in yields per acre	68 (56.67)	52 (43.33)
3	Total increased gross income	57 (47.50)	63 (52.50)
4	Total increased net income	53 (44.17)	67 (55.83)

Table 7. Constraints elicited by the respondent (n=120)

S. no	Constraint	Frequency	Percentage
1	Non-availability of the implement	91	75.83
2	Initial high cost of the implement	79	65.83
3	Single use of the implement only for cutting / remaining idle for most part of the season	87	72.50
4	No govt support on the implement	81	67.50
5	Demonstrations are conducted in few pockets only	65	54.17

Table 8. Suggestions expressed by the respondents (n=120)

S.no	Suggestions	Frequency	Percentage
1	More demos should be conducted to know the working and usage of the implement	75	62.50
2	Awards/incentives to the farmers for increasing adoption of this technology	79	65.83
3	Implement can be brought under Custom hiring centres by Agril dept	87	72.50
4	Govt support/ subsidy should be given on the implement	81	67.50

3.8 Suggestions Expressed by the Respondents

The results from Table 8 indicated that among the 120 respondents, 72.50 of the respondents opined that Implement can be brought under Custom hiring centres by Agril dept followed by 67.50 percent of the farmers felt that Govt support/ subsidy should be given on the implement to know the working and usage of the implement and also for creating awareness on the technology, its uses and benefits among the farming community. 65.83 percent of the respondents opined that awards/incentives should be given for successful adoption of this technology by the farmers, which will help in motivating the fellow neighboring farmers towards adoption of the technology and thereby the technology spreads in larger areas.

4. CONCLUSION

In cotton, pink boll worm is the major pest effecting the crop right from flowering stage to boll maturity stage. Incidence of the pink boll worm during the flowering stage results in rosette flowers, flower drop and subsequently effect the bolls if no proper plant protection measures are not taken. Incidence of pink boll worm on the bolls results in the premature opening of the bolls, poor quality of cotton lint due to the change in the colour and reduction in the weight of the cotton as the seed is effected by pink boll worm. To control the pink boll worm integrated pest management practices are to be taken collectively by all the farmers which mainly include steps like installation of pheromone traps, spraying of neem oil and recommended insecticides based on the ETL levels of the pest, destruction of rosette flowers, timely termination of the crop and incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the shredder. Incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil after harvesting will

help in reducing the pink boll worm incidence. The present study was conducted with an aim to determine the effectiveness and usefulness of incorporation of cotton stubbles into the soil by the farmers. More studies are to be done on the effectiveness of incorporation of the cotton stubbles and the pink boll worm incidence by taking the feedback from all the cotton growing farmers in the country for creating awareness on pink boll worm management and thus helping the farmers to achieve more yields and good net returns.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Patil SB. Studies on management of cotton pink bollworm *Pectinophora Gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae). Ph. D. Thesis submitted to University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (India); 2003.
2. Prasad BR, Rahman SJ, Sudarshanam A and Raghu PRR. Assessment of different modules for management of pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) in *Bt* cotton. J Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2018; 6(6):132-135.
3. Anonymous. Area, production and productivity of cotton in India. Cotton Advisory Board, Mumbai. 2015; 1:25-27.
4. Srinivas, Sreenivas AG Hanchinal SG, Hurali S and Beldhadi, R V. Comparative biology of pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae) on different hosts. Journal of

- Entomology and Zoology Studies. 2018; 7(1):1053-1060.
5. Sandhya Rani B, Prasad NVVSD, Arjuna Rao P, Srinivasa Rao V. Seasonal progression and incidence of *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) on Cotton. *Annals of Plant Protection Sciences*. 2010;8(2): 323-326.
 6. Dhurua S and Gujar GT. Field-evolved resistance to *Bt* toxin Cry1Ac in the pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae), from India. *Pest Management Science*. 2011;67:898–903.
 7. Ghosh PK. ISCI silver jubilee lecture series-lecture on “Genetically modified crops in India with special references to *Bt*-cotton”. *Journal of Indian Society for Cotton Improvement*. 2001;18(4): 106-107.
 8. Kranthi KR. Pink bollworm strikes *Bt* cotton. *Cotton Statistics News*. 2015; 35(1):1-6.
 9. Singh JP, Lather BPS and Mor BR. Exit behavior of pink bollworm (*Pectinophora gossypiella*) larvae. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*.1988;58(3): 236–237.
 10. Kranthi KR, Russell D, Wanjari R, Kherde M, Munje S, Lavhe N, Armes N. In-season changes in resistance to insecticides in *Helicoverpa armigera* (Lepidoptera: Noctuidae) in India. *Journal of Economic Entomology*. 2002;95(1): 134–142.
 11. Kranthi KR, Russell DA. Changing trends in cotton pest management. In R. Peshin, AK, Dhawan (Eds.). *Integrated pest management: Innovation-development*. Springer. 2009;2: 499–541.
 12. ICAC. International cotton advisory committee. Factors influencing the use of pesticides in cotton in India. Washington DC, USA: Report from the Expert Panel on Social, Environmental and Economic Performance of Cotton Production (SEEP). 2010;1: 57.
 13. Hargreaves H. List of recorded cotton insects of the world. *Common Wealth Institute of Entomology, London*. 1948;50.
 14. Kannan M Utamasamy S and Mohan S. Impact of insecticides on sucking pests and natural enemy complex of transgenic cotton. *Current Science*. 2004;86(4): 726-729.
 15. Vakudavath CBN, Kumbhare S, Kranthi S, Satija U, Kranthi KR. Field-evolved resistance of pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* (Saunders) (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae), to transgenic *Bacillus thuringiensis* (*Bt*) cotton expressing crystal 1Ac (Cry1Ac) and Cry2Ab in India. *Pest Management Science*. 2018;74:2544–2554.
 16. Jayaswal AP. Preliminary studies on the carryover of pink bollworm in cotton seed in Haryana. *Journal of Research, Haryana Agricultural University, Hissar*. 1971;1(1): 83-85.
 17. Simwat GS, AS, Sidhu. Mortality of diapausing larvae of pink bollworm, *Pectinophora gossypiella* in cotton stalks during summer in Punjab. *Indian Journal of Entomology*. 1982;44: 182-184.
 18. Krishna V, Ellicott E, Badarinath KVS, Vermote E. MODIS derived fire characteristics and aerosol optical depth variations during the agricultural residue burning season, North India. *Environmental Pollution*. 2011;159(6): 1560–1569.
 19. IARI. Crop residues management with conservation agriculture: Potential, constraints and policy needs. *Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi*. 2012;32.
 20. Dubey AK, Chandra P, Padhee D, Gangil S. Energy from cotton stalks and other crop residues. *CIAE, Bhopal, India*; 2004.
 21. Sutaria GS, Vora VD, Vekariya PD, Akbari KN. Technology for rapid composting of cotton stalk. *International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research*. 2016; 6(1):211-216.
 22. Ansari MR, Chandargi DM. Effectiveness of induction training programme organized for assistant agriculture officers (Farm women). *Journal of Extension Education*. 2000;11(1): 2645-2650.
 23. Madhu Shaker BR, Hemantha Kumar J, Jagan Mohan Rao P, Sri Ranjitha P, Chaitanya V, Ravi Kumar K. Knowledge and adoption levels of the farmers on direct seeding among rice farmers of Khammam District of Telangana State, India. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2020; 9(6): 1877-1887.

24. Ramanjaneyulu AV, Ramprasad B, Sainath N, Umarani E, Pallavi Ch, Vijay J, Jagadeeshwar R. Crop Residue Management in Cotton. Chronicle of Bioresource Management. 2021;5(1):001-008.

© 2022 Kumar et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/92632>