

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_90584
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmentally friendly agent against fall armyworm (<i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>): antifeedant potency of <i>Mentha spicata</i> aqueous extracts
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:

(<https://www.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/editorial-policy>)

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	Although the research is of relevant importance for pest control, taking into account the process evidenced in the document, I consider that it does not have sufficient scientific rigor to be published. Among the aspects that present the greatest problems, the following stand out: Qualitative phytochemical characterization tests are carried out, pointing out some possible compounds because they are commonly found in plants, however, there is no analytical test that allows an approach to evidence such compounds The methodology of the qualitative tests (phenols and tannins) do not correspond to the referenced procedures The calibration curves for tannins and phenols present a correlation coefficient that is too low, which translates into a large error in the prediction of the results. The precise methodology to calculate the percentage of antifeedant activity is not specified	
Minor REVISION comments	Some results do not correspond to reality, for example, they indicate that in the glycerin extract the consumption of the corn leaf was 34.86 cm ² , but the leaf only averaged 28 cm ² On several occasions they write the scientific names without using italics	
Optional/General comments	If they are going to quantitatively measure the extracts, there is no need to do the qualitative tests	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johanny Aguillón Osma
Department, University & Country	University of Quindío, Colombia