

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_91469
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of some biopesticides against pod borer in garden pea (<i>Pisum sativum</i> L.) under natural conditions of Prayagraj (U.P.)
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p><u>Serious Major revision</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First of all, the work is carried out carelessly, the placement on the page leaves much to be desired, please pay attention to all the criteria of placement in the page (font, type, tables, their size, etc) according to the requirements of the journal; 2. Do not leave space between paragraphs and type an appropriate spacing at the beginning of each paragraph; 3. Write an ACKNOWLEDGMENT before the references point, if this work was financed from public funds or private funds, or is personal research, or the research was conducted within a department of a research unit or a research University department; 4. Each section should be numbered, starting with the 1. INTRODUCTION to the CONCLUSION, except the bibliography; 5. In the ABSTRACT part, please replace the @ sign with a corresponding symbol....I don't understand what this symbol represents? Why it was introduced in the text? 6. In the INTRODUCTION section there is a number of bibliographic data that cannot be found in the BIBLIOGRAPHY section, not even numerically, and not even that! They seem to be copied from another article and simply inserted into this manuscript; 7. All bibliographic data found in the BIBLIOGRAPHY section must be found in the INTRODUCTION section; 8. Pay attention to the bibliographic data: please pass a DOI or WOS or ISSN to be able to identify the data references, there are some bibliographical data that cannot be identified; 9. Please add more recent bibliographic data, 2020-2022; The bibliographic data to be at least 18-20 in number, or even more; 10. In point 2. MATERIALS and METHODS: should be passed as the first point 2.1 MATERIALS, please explain the origin of the materials used (neem oil, bacillus thuringiensis, etc.), some of their characteristics, the manufacturer, etc. Also in this section, please write the full name of each material used and not just its abbreviation used in the text. For example...what is the scientific name of NSKE or Bt, etc? 11. In section 2. MATERIALS and METHODS, point 2.2. METHODS – describe de methods used; 12. According to which standards were the tests performed? 13. What was the purpose of this cost-benefit calculation? Describe a little? 14. In the RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS section, the same problem as in the INTRODUCTION part... here I find bibliographic data that seem to be copied from another manuscript that cannot be found in the BIBLIOGRAPHY section; 15. From the gaffe shown for the cost-benefit part, nothing is understood...give some explanations on the graph, on the X-axis as well as on the Y-axis; 16. Please restore the RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS section. In this section, the authors only refer to certain bibliographic data that say that what they found only correspond or are in accordance with other studied bibliographic data. But what exactly is in accordance with and what did they find? Where does what they studied come from? There is no clear explanation? So, please in more detail, please add other types of tests performed and some graphs containing relevant data and information about the research conducted in this manuscript; 17. Please redo the CONCLUSIONS section after the completion of the results and discussions section according to what I found. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After completing the requirements and the corrections made, I express my consent for the manuscript to be published.</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:	Nituica Mihaela
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for Textile and Leather (INCDTP), Romania