

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89912
Title of the Manuscript:	Resistance in Pink Bollworm <i>Pectinophora gossypiella</i> (Saunders) against Bt cotton, a major threat to cotton in India: A brief review
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>-Authors could tighten up the introductory section. It looks too brief and simple and acceptable for review studies or synthesis report. They could consider doing so with research progress, general overview of the key terms or subjects, the need for this review study to some key stakeholders or players, implications or effects of the phenomenon on some key sectors like agriculture, health and so on.</p> <p>-Re-organization or structuring of entire manuscript: The introduction must be followed by an empirical review or analytical framework/model (Methodology/Approach) which should be designed by the authors to link up how the entire study is set up, how the various sections were examined or analyzed. Hence, a section for "Methodology" must be created to briefly inform readers how authors analyzed data (i.e., was data analyzed using a systematic literature review [SLR]?), acquired information and research strategy used in drafting this review report.</p> <p>-After doing the above, authors can then present the results/discuss findings against existing body of knowledge. These sections: 2.0, 2.1 to 2.5 – should be placed under is section for consistency, clarity and coherence.</p> <p>-Again, authors could consider coining each of these sections in a format that encapsulates: general descriptions of the subject, overview/gaps and opportunities in these multiple factors that result in resistance or drive this study's objectives.</p> <p>-Description or evaluation for some of the sub-sections in section 3.0 are too loose. From an objective/constructive perspective, the authors need to make thorough assessments from their perspectives briefly, based on other proposed strategies. It must be made clear which strategies are standardized or globally accepted, under which conditions or parameters, possible limitations for the implementation of some of these strategies, linking them up to factors raised in previous sections.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>-The conclusion is too brief. It must clearly highlight the main aim of the study, summary of key findings, relevance of the outcome of this study or review study to researchers, and possible limitations of the study that could suggest or drive future research.</p> <p>-Authors could recommend or propose measures that could come before the conclusion section, based on the findings of the study.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Authors should kindly check the entire manuscript thoroughly to correct the proficiency level of the paper.	
Optional/General comments	Generally, the manuscript is informative and could be of relevance to support basic research with similar scope. It will serve as a great deal for other scholars with such review or synthesis report. However, the current state of the manuscript is not publishable until authors effect the mandatory comments or suggestions raised to improve the structure and content of the paper.	

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:	Isaac Sarfo
Department, University & Country	Nanjing University of Information Science and Technology, China