

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Crop Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCS_97300
Title of the Manuscript:	Population Density of Small Cabbage Bug (Eurydema pulchrum Westw.)(Hemiptera: Pentatomidae) in Cabbage Plants of Batu Palano, West Sumatera
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.journalajrcs.com/index.php/AJRCS/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The work evaluates the density of the insect, which allows taking the actions that the case warrants. 2. The title expresses the situation under study. 3. It is necessary to specify the research design. 4. The work has an adequate structure. 5. It is recommended to specify the impact of the research. 6. The references are adjusted to the context of the investigation.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor: yes, acceptable	
Optional/General comments	Optional: justify the type of sampling used.	

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:	Manuel Emilio Milla Pino
Department, University & Country	National University of Jaen, Peru