

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102377
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparitive efficacy of selected Bio-pesticides against tomato fruit borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (Hubner)] on tomato [<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i> (L.)]
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The manuscript important for scientific community, comparing the difference in efficiency of selected Bio-pesticides against tomato fruit borer.</p> <p>2- The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3- The abstract of the article isn't comprehensive; it should include summarized categories of Introduction, methods, results and conclusion.</p> <p>4-The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5-The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6-Few number of references is used; more references should be added.</p> <p>7- In Discussion section: The discussion was poor, the results should be correlated with more studies that done before. The data needed to be discussed with more updated references (up to at least last 3 years).</p> <p>8- The author should clarify scientifically, on what properties the best effective treatments have versus the least ones.</p> <p>9- It should be demonstrated the side effects of these treatments.</p> <p>10- All the abbreviations throughout the manuscript should be demonstrated as: BAS, DAS, ...,etc.</p> <p>11- Conclusion should be rewritten and more clarified.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English needs to be improved & grammar should be revised.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Moataza Hassan Omran
Department, University & Country	National Research Center, Biotechnology Research Institute, Egypt