

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_90608
Title of the Manuscript:	Predicting the major organism species in tobacco in Cao Bang province, Vietnam based on the weather conditions
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalarrb.com/index.php/ARRB/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	<p>The submitted article predicts pest infestation in tobacco plantations. Therefore, it has application to the agricultural area. It is a work that presents new data, not a simple revision.</p> <p>It is important to go into more detail in the text about the meaning of the different levels of damage caused to the plantation, which appear in some tables. And compare, in more detail, actual and predicted results.</p> <p>References need to be standardized.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Only a few punctual corrections are needed:</p> <p>In the Abstract, line 4: suitable; line 5: Excel;</p> <p>In the Introduction, on page 1, line 7: reproduction and survival; line11: its distribution;</p> <p>On page 2, line 17: The activity of organisms that caused diseases...</p> <p>On Materials and Methods, line 5: At this stage is easy to be infected by important organism species? On line 11: which organism? On line 13: to decide a final predict result? The sentence got weird, because the modeler analyzes the different predicted results and comes to a conclusion about the best prediction. And it is also necessary to detail the models used or cite more references that support their use.</p> <p>On Results and Discussion, line 6: ... are the same in comparison with other studies;</p> <p>On page 4, line 12: to affect the growth;</p> <p>On page 5, line 8: is affected severely; on topic 3.2.1, causing losses?</p>	
Optional/General comments	After these corrections, the article can be accepted for publication.	

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)	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Claudio José Von Zuben
Department, University & Country	São Paulo State University, Brazil