

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_96368
Title of the Manuscript:	Eco-friendly management of fruit fly (<i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i>) on infesting Bitter gourd
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.journalapri.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is written casually and not written for the scientific community, as it lack the basic details to the scientific forum 2. The title has to be slightly modified as "Eco-friendly management of fruit fly (<i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i>) infesting bitter gourd" 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive 4. The subsection, particularly methodology, results and discussion has to be completely revised as per the comments indicated below. 5. The manuscript lacks scientific and technical aspects which was indicated in the comments 6. Few more references need to add <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Basic idea of the management fruit fly is appropriate and it's an important topic relevant to recent problem. Fruit fly is major pest and causing considered yield loss in bitter gourd. However, the issue can be scientifically approached. 2. Methodology: The treatment structure need to be checked. In scientific manuscripts, commercial or trade names of the products should not be mentioned. The basic or common name or chemical name of the compound should be indicated. Otherwise it declared advertising about the formulation of the company or popularizing a brand through this journal. 3. In methodology it was mentioned as hybrid tomato variety "BARI Hybrid Bitter gourd 2", indicates that the manuscript was written very casually. 4. For example one treatment structure T1- Lycopmax 2g/lit of water+ Cutrac+ Sticky trap+ Sanitation. In this what is Cutrac – common name, what is the dose or active ingredient, Sticky trap – how many numbers used, what type - yellow or other colour, size of the trap, Sanitation – means how it was performed in the trial plot, periodically or with sufficient interval, In other treatment mechanical control – how it was done, mechanical collection of insect or fruit? - all this details should be indicated in the methodology. Like this in all treatments the details has to be added for scientific understanding. 5. Results and Discussion: After indicating the common name or active principle in the compound in the methodology, its effect and managing the pest can be discussed. Please indicate how it works on pest and what is the mode of action, these details can be addressed in the results and discussion. 6. The tables are derived from one experiment but segregated as different tables as 5 tables. All these can be accommodated as one table. In each table, no need to give the treatment details. The 5th table is devoid of scientific value. 7. The graphical figure added in the manuscript is not clearly depicting the results. The model of the graph may be changed to understand about the results well. 8. In R&D, the other methods or same compounds used in other experiments need to be discussed for their effectiveness against fruit fly. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language of the manuscript need to re-look. Also check spell errors in the text.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The manuscript has various lacunas in the scientific content. The language also needs to be upgraded. • The editor has to decide based on the comments given for publication of the manuscript to maintain the reputation of the journal. 	

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:	R.P.Soundararajan
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India