

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_105054
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Analysis of UV and UV-LED Light Traps for Pest Control: A Cost-Efficiency Perspective
Type of the 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. The manuscript provides the scientific community, especially those who work with agricultural entomology, with important information on the management of pests and pests using different types of lights.</p> <p>The title is well articulated and consistent with the purpose of the article.</p> <p>The article is understandable and briefly presents all the items that make up the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript is well structured, cohesive, good grammar, adequate comprehension and appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript has a good scientific basis and is substantiated with good and current references, which denotes good research work.</p> <p>Yes. The references are sufficient and appropriate for the topic being worked on.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript has good grammar and semantics resulting in good understanding and reading.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically well substantiated, has an adequate design, very well written, clear and cohesive text, well-defined objectives, well-constructed methodology, has a discussion without gaps and demonstrates the feasibility of the manuscript within the proposed schedule.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelo Cutrim
Department, University & Country	INPA, Brazil