

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_90297
Title of the Manuscript:	Field efficacy and economics of different insecticides against tomato fruit borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner)]
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.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>The manuscript has serious problems of expression in English and wording of the text. Also, the tables and figures are not described (or at least there is no clear association with the text). Many phrases are repetitive. There is a lack of coherence and clarity in the presentation.</p> <p>However, I made observations directly on the manuscripts and if the suggestions are followed, I think the work can be improved. There seems to be some work behind this work, but the way of presentation is inappropriate.</p> <p>Suggested Major Improvements:</p> <p>TO THE ABSTRACT There are terminology errors, for example: affective instead of efficient, or expression in English such as: Among the treatmentinstead of ... <Among the treatments ></p> <p>TO INTRODUCTION Many phrases are incoherent and should be reformulated, such as: a.The polyphagous pest of worldwide occurrence inflicting annual crop damage in India worth US \$1 billion. I suggest: <The pest is polyphagous with a wide worldwide distribution. In India alone, it causes \$1 billion worth of damage annually.></p> <p>b.This pest accounts for the consumption of half of the total insecticide used in India for protection of different crops. I suggest: <Half of all insecticides used in India for the protection of various crops are used for this pest. ></p> <p><i>Ambiguous sentences</i> c.In Tamil Nadu, losses of fruit range 40-50%. My suggestion:<In Tamil Nadu, fruit losses range from 40 to 50%></p> <p>e.reported 5–55% losses from this insect pest in the tomato growing areas of India. Something is missing from the sentence. So, needed provides all information.</p> <p>f.Tomato fruit worm has also caused 35% yield loss in tomato and 37.79% specifically in Karnataka, India. This phrase is ambiguous. What did you mean by the percentage of 37.79...is it for another crop or for tomatoes? Maybe you wanted to say that the percentage varies between 35 and 37.79 especially in....???</p> <p>... and others, for example sources to add or expression error</p> <p>TO MATERIAL AND METHODS Related to: The seedlings of the one month there transplanted plant to plant and row to row spacing of 60 X 45 cm was maintained. My point of view: The sentence is unclear. Needs clarification</p> <p>Some abbreviations are unexplained. How are DAP and MOP? I suggested a detail.</p> <p>Related to: Observation were recorded My point of view: Usually, observations are made not recorded.</p> <p>Related to first formula I don't understand what the formula wants to reflect? Number of larvae? Or what are you talking about? Give a quantitative and qualitative measure of these factors used in the formula: control, treatment... Also, I suggest an association with a reference: Who does this formula belong to?</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>And some errors of expression for which I made suggestions directly on the manuscript</p> <p>TO RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS</p> <p>Related to first paragraph My point of view: Here is a very long sentence. Incoherent and repetitive. Please separate each tangible result with a point. Make shorter sentences that have cursive. Do not repeat the same words for each result interpretation (effective insecticide). For example, you used the following expression n times: ...<proved their superiority over other insecticides in reducing percentage of larval population>...and others</p> <p>Related to statement: The yield among the treatments was significant. My questions are: is it significant? what compared to what? I suggest to be removed</p> <p>Related to sentence: Among the treatment studied the best and most economical treatment was Spinosad (1:6.72), Indoxacarb 14.5% SC 14.5SC (1:6.42), followed by Emamectin benzoate 5% SG (1:6.3), Novaluron 45% SC (1:5.09), Flubendiamide20% WG (1:4.45), Fipronil 5% SC (1:7.9), (1:3.92), Neem oil 0.03% EC (1:3.45) as compared to control T0 (1:3.04). My opinion: this paragraph is identical to the one in the abstract, including the mistakes... it must be reformulated</p> <p>Regarding all tables (1,2,3) and figure 1 My opinion: The reference in the text (description) of all tables and figure are missing. It is necessary an association with the existing description (where appropriate). These data must be interpreted somewhere.</p> <p>To Table 1 is needed to be clarified what is mean DBS? But DAS? My suggestion: Explanation in the description in the text or immediately below the table</p> <p>TO CONCLUSION</p> <p>From what is presented in the paper, it appears that all insecticides had the same level of effectiveness, or, the results say the opposite. It should refer especially to the most effective ones, because they have had comparative studies. They can't all be very good/effective.</p> <p>And others...typo errors (see direct on the manuscript)</p> <p>TO REFERENCES</p> <p>In general, the sources in the text are found in the list and are described unitarily. However, in Ref. 14, a point is required between the journal and the number, in Ref. 19 and 22, the name of the journal must be italicized.</p> <p>All the suggestions can be found directly in the manuscript, in the right place, for the ease of understanding by the authors</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ioana Grozea
Department, University & Country	Banat's University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania