

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_96399
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio efficacy of microbial formulations of Beauveria bassiana and SINPV against Spodoptera litura F. and Aphis craccivora Koch. in vegetable cowpea
Type of the Article	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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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> <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>1. Yes, I consider that the proposed manuscript is quite important for the scientific community all over the world.</p> <p>2. The title is comprehensive and complete.</p> <p>3. Good abstract, except the writing errors – please check and correct.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure is all right.</p> <p>5. It seems to be, at least according to the presented data, following the presented experiments.</p> <p>6. There are enough references and well cited. What I notice, to some of them there is no correlation with the year – correct the mistakes (for example, „CABI, 2022” is „CABI, 2014”; „Armes et al.” – 1995 or 1999?).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language needs some improvements. There are missing words, additional or missing spaces.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>What is List 1??? Is looks like a table, but it's not included in tables. Why?</p> <p>What is Plate 1 and Plate 2? Please refer to them as Figures and write the title below the photos, with explanations. After plate 2 there are two more photos, no title.</p> <p>Pay attention to formulas... please use the correct format for equations.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Berca Mihai
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania