

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_101912
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy of some bio-pesticides with Spinosad against mustard aphid <i>Lipaphis erysimi</i> Kalt. in mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>)
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><u>Compulsory</u> 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>	<p>Required REVIEW Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript) R/ THIS MANUSCRIPT IS VERY IMPORTANT FOR THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY, BECAUSE IT IS RESEARCH FOR THE CONTROL OF PESTS THAT AFFECT AGRICULTURE. Is the title of the article adequate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title) R/ THE TITLE IS ADEQUATE, ONLY THE SCIENTIFIC NAMES OF THE SPECIES UNDER STUDY MUST BE CORRECTED Is the article summary comprehensive? R/ THE ABSTRACT MUST BE CORRECTED ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. DO NOT FOLLOW THE DIRECTIONS. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? R/ THE AUTHORS HAVE NOT MADE SUBDIVISIONS OR SUBSECTIONS, WHICH MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND THE ARTICLE. THEY SHOULD IMPROVE THE WRITING OF THE ARTICLE, ACCORDING TO THE SUGGESTIONS MADE Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? R/ WITH SO MANY PROBLEMS IN THE WRITING AND ORGANIZATION OF THE ARTICLE, I THINK IT DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES AND SHOULD BE READJUST ACCORDING TO THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them on the review form. R/ THE REFERENCES (16) MAY BE ADEQUATE, BUT THEY DO NOT FOLLOW THE JOURNAL'S GUIDELINES AND MUST BE READAPPROPRIATE. BOTH IN THE TEXT AND IN THE LIST OF FINAL REFERENCES. <p>(In addition to the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments) R/ THIS IS AN INTERESTING TOPIC, BUT THE AUTHORS DID NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL AND THEREFORE MADE MULTIPLE ERRORS IN THE MAKING OF THE ARTICLE. THE ARTICLE MUST BE REFORMULATED AND SUBMITTED AGAIN FOR YOUR ANALYSIS AND APPROVAL FOR PUBLICATION</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>REVIEW minor comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the language/English quality of the article adequate for scholarly communications? R/ I THINK THIS ARTICLE IS INTERESTING, BUT IT HAS MANY PROBLEMS ADJUSTING THE JOURNAL'S RULES AND THEREFORE DOES NOT MEET THE CONDITIONS OF BEING SUITABLE FOR ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION. THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE MUST BE ANALYZED WHEN ERRORS LOCATED ARE FIXED. 	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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:	Anselmo Enrique Ferrer Hernandez
Department, University & Country	Havana University, Cuba