

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_97675
Title of the Manuscript:	Farmer's Adoption of Insect Pests Management Strategies in Organic Tomato Field
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.journalapj.com/index.php/APRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	-	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Need to be improved. 6. References are not sufficient. To improve the discussion section, few more references should be added in manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English writing can be improved.	
Optional/General comments	- The manner of writing the result and discussion section is not correct. Actually there is no discussion. The purpose of the discussion is to interpret and describe the significance of our findings in light of what was already known about the research problem being investigated, and to explain any new understanding or fresh insights about the problem after you've taken the findings into consideration. - The conclusion presented here, only repeat the results and should be written again.	

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:	Saeedeh Javar
Department, University & Country	Golestan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, AREEO, Iran