

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> Abstract should end with a statement of conclusion regarding suitability of the best treatments (according to this study) in the mitigation of yield loss due to pod borer.</p> <p><b>Keywords</b> Authors should reduce the redundancy here by choosing only one of either the scientific or common name of pest.</p> <p><b>Introduction</b> (1) First sentence of paragraph 1: Authors should provide reference if the statement is not theirs. (2) Line 11: Being a cool season crop, authors could tell if there are any points to support its growth on hills during summer when it is presumably exposed more to possible unfavourable conditions: temperatures, water deficit, etc? (3) Line 27: Introduction should end with a statement on aim of the research was proposed. E.g., the present study aims to evaluate the activity of biopesticides and provide support in the management/prevention of the mentioned plant pest.</p> <p><b>Materials and Methods</b> (1) Line 6: If any of the biopesticides used in the study was prepared by authors, information regarding the procedures should be provided. In a case were the materials were outsourced, the source need mention as well. (2) Line 7: If there was a relation/formular used to determine this, it needs be stated with reference. (3) Line 10: Authors should briefly explain how the effect of pod borer on the % yield (% pod damage) was determined. (4) Line 11: Authors should put thereport in the past tense. E.g, The gross returns were calculated by multiplying..... (5) Line 14: If possible, authors should reference the relation/formulae.</p> <p><b>Results and Discussion</b> (1) Sentence 3: Authors should cite table 1. (2) Line 31: Authors should place table 1 at end of sentence. (3) Line 47: Authors should cite both figure 1 and table 2 at end of sentence. (4) Line 51: Authors should check the value (1:1.4.0) and tell if they meant (1:4.0) or (1:1.40)? (5) Line 59: Authors should cite (Table 2.) and bring the table at end of sentence. (6) Table 1: Values in the table 1 could show corelations between/among treatments. (7) Figure 1: Authors should include a legend to give brief insight of the content in figure. The bars of the 'x axis of the figure should indicate the different treatments, either with numbers or names of treatment', with the bar representing the control placed first from the left/zero point preferrably.</p> <p><b>Conclusion -</b></p> <p><b>Refeences</b> (1) Following journal's guide, apart form the 'RESULTS AND DISCUSSION' section, numbers in parenthesis enough to reference a statement in the intext citations in the body of manuscript. (2) Authors should look up and complete the references. The numbering of intext citations was not consistent. E.g., 1,2,3,7,9,11,15,16,21,24,25,27,28,29,30,33,34,38. Majority of the citations in text were not found in 'REFERENCE' section. The following items were found in the 'REFERENCE' section but are not found in the manuscrip intex citations: Babariya et al., 2010 Babu and Mallikarju 2012 Bhushan et al., 2011 Chavan et al., 2017 Chitralkha et al., 2018 Dadas et al., 2019 Dinesh et al., 2017 Gautam et al., 2018 Gomez and Gomez 1976</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Check up the grammatical errors pointed out in red ink in the returning manuscript.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Peter Chikezie Ayogu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Minho, Portugal</b>