

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_109492
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of life cycle of gram pod borer (<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>, Hubner) on vegetable Pea
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript are important for scientific community. this article is important for the scientific community as it describes the cycle of a crop pest. anything that can help develop strategies to combat this pest.</p> <p>2. Life cycle of gram pod borer <i>Helicoverpa armigera</i>, Hubner, evaluation on vegetable Pea in</p> <p>3. yes</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. the format of the article should be: introduction, material and method, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION and conclusion.</p> <p>5. the manuscript is not properly scientific</p> <p>7. The references are not sufficient. Samuel NIBOUCHE.,19994. CYCLE ÉVOLUTIF DE HELICOVERPA ARMIGERA (HÜBNER, 1808) (LEPIDOPTERA, NOCTUIDAE) DANS L'OUEST DU BURKINA FASO. THESE présentée à l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure Agronomique de Montpellier,152p.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In general, the abstract of this article does not mention the method used. The author does not give us the age of the eggs collected. there is no image of the pest or of the evolution of the insect during the six stages described by the authors of the article. The methodology for the experiment, aims of the study and the study design are not clearly defined and does not allow the experiment to be reproduced. The article does not provide anything new in terms of scientific information. It does not specify the study area. The table after the conclusion must be deleted and follow the guideline of the journal.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Sidibe Hamadou
Department, University & Country	Burkina Faso