

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_101912</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Efficacy of some bio-pesticides with Spinosad against mustard aphid <i>Lipaphis erysimi</i> Kalt. in mustard (<i>Brassica juncea</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> 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>The title should be reviewed. It seems that all treatments will be done with bio-pesticides when not.</p> <p>The abstract typo/format should be reviewed. Some of the phrases are too long, in order to compresion shorter phrases are recommended.</p> <p>Please, indicate the full scientific name as first mentioned. Please, update periods when mentioning production (data from 2007 is too old) Page 2, 3-4 paragraph need to be reviewed (some words are missing). Last paragraph of introduction should be reviewed.</p> <p>Page 3: varety → variety The list of biopesticides is not according to law. Imidacloprid is not and spinosad according to EU regulation is not.</p> <p>Results were expressed as % reduction, but there is no indication about significant differences among them. Please, include it. The letters included in table 1 are not understandable. What did you compare? All togheter? Not by day, not by treatment? Include the statistical in Fig 1 Results cost-benefit must be reported in other way aim to be easy to understand it, be self-comprehensive Conclusion should be re-wrieten according to previous comments and recommendations should be done, according to results.</p> <p>The manuscript can be improved from a scientifically point of view.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Some phrases should be reviewed	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	It seems a list of results more than an explanation of trial.	

### 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:	Marta Giner
Department, University & Country	Spain