

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_104277
Title of the Manuscript:	Determining the Effect of biopesticides and chemicals against pod borer [<i>Helicoverpa armigera</i> (L.)] on chickpea (<i>Cicer arietinum</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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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"> The work submitted is relevant and of importance; however, authors must take care of the form, style and syntax; give order and coherence to what is intended to be demonstrated. The title of the manuscript seems appropriate. It is suggested to improve the writing of the abstract, taking care of the order of the ideas. As well as the structure and relevant information of the work. The abstract should be concise and informative. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used, major findings with important data and conclusions. Different sub-sections, as given below, should be used. Generally non-standard abbreviations should not be used, if necessary they should be clearly defined in the abstract, at first use. The subsections and structure are well marked. The work can be improved both in substance and in form, taking care of the writing. References appear to be sufficient; however, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references. <p>Review the wording of the information, errors and conditions are marked in the document (in color) that the authors must review, analyze and make the corresponding modifications. The document presents some writing details (order, syntax, style) on which it is suggested to review and work. It is important to review the entire document and correct the units in which the values are expressed (international units). Nomenclature and Units. Internationally accepted rules and the international system of units (SI) should be used. If other units are mentioned, please give their equivalent in SI.</p> <p>Chemical nomenclature, as laid down in the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry and the official recommendations of the IUPAC-IUB Combined Commission on Biochemical Nomenclature should be followed. All biocides and other organic compounds must be identified by their Geneva names when first used in the text. Active ingredients of all formulations should be likewise identified.</p> <p>It is necessary to emphasize the following sections Introduction. Provide a factual background, clearly defined problem, proposed solution, a brief literature survey and the scope and justification of the work done. Material and methods. Give adequate information to allow the experiment to be reproduced. Already published methods should be mentioned with references. Table headings should be placed above the table. Footnotes should be placed below the table with superscript lowercase letters.</p> <p>The discussion needs to be consistent in comparing the results obtained with others from international reports (with scientific and convincing foundations). The manuscript does not present a conclusion (conclusions), which is necessary for the authors to review. This should briefly state the major findings of the study.</p> <p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3].</p> <p>Necessary suggestions to carry out. Reference to a journal: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Reference to a book:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. Reference to Web-resource or electronic articles.</p> <p>3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006; 16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work: This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Where available, the URLs of the references are provided. The text must comply with the style and bibliographic requirements described in the guidelines for authors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3].</p> <p>Necessary suggestions to carry out.</p> <p>Reference to a journal: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p>Reference to a book: 2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p> <p>Reference to Web-resource or electronic articles. 3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006; 16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work: This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of The State of Mexico, México