

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_101937
Title of the Manuscript:	INFESTATION STATUS OF SOME MAJOR INSECT PESTS OF SOYBEAN AND THEIR MANAGEMENT
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.journalarja.com/index.php/ARJA/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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It should be substantially improved</p> <p>It should be substantially improved</p> <p>It should be substantially enriched with recent bibliography</p> <p>Very concise current study and immediate applicability, however from this perspective it would be advisable to give more body to the research while avoiding the redundancy of the text to what is already reflected in the tables, that is, starting from them to derive knowledge and technology and not only focus on the description, leaving aside the consequences on the management of pests in the context of the crop; then, it can be described and the type of damage it causes, as well as the technical characteristics of the insecticides and botanicals used and their effect on the pest in a specific way, the results could also be enriched by including a statistical analysis two-way, that is, not only the comparison of the treatments within each date, but also how they behave with respect to time in variables 4.1.1, 4.1.2; 4.2.1, 4.2.2; 4.3.1, 4.3.2; 4.4.1, 4.1.2, since it is observed that when there is no intervention (control) the pest continues to increase while for the treatments the first date makes the distinction of pest control with insecticides and botanicals; the second and third date may have similarities in some treatments, when comparing between them and with respect to the control it could be chosen with only two applications or reinforced with the three applications, but the discussion is enriched for a greater support of the conclusions. Finally, the objectivity of this type of research is its eminently practical approach and its applicability, as opposed to doing research for the mere fact of doing it.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> 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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Manuel Soto Parra
Department, University & Country	Universidad autónoma de Chihuahua, México