

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_90740
Title of the Manuscript:	“Comparative efficacy of insecticides, NSKE and karanj oil against shoot and fruit borer, <i>Earias vittella</i> (Fabricius.) on okra”
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>)

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>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be rewritten clearly stating the problem, its relevance and the objectives of the study <p>Materials & methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authors need to give details of the insecticides ie ai, sources, rates, methods of application etc in this section since that is the basis of the paper ETL- source, why start observations after its attainment, Does data on % infestation include the ETL values, were same plants sampled in plots? Sampling methods suspect. Authors should preferably have used established techniques available for the insect. Authors need to state data analysis procedures. For cost benefit analysis authors should use standard existing techniques to make conclusions credible <p>Results & discussion</p> <p>This section simply repeats the figures in the table. Authors do not attempt to explain the scientific basis for their results and make very scant references. Did these references test exactly the same insecticides at same rates etc. If so why was this work done, just to confirm?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Shown directly on the manuscript	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Paul B Tanzubil
Department, University & Country	Ghana